HENRI BOURASSA, M. P.

GREAT BRITAIN

AND

CANADA

TOPICS OF THE DAY

A LECTURE DELIVERED AT THE "THÉATRE NATIONAL FRANÇAIS," MONTREAL, ON THE 20th OF OCTOBER 1901.

(Translated from the French.)

MONTREAL

C. O. BEAUCHEMIN & FILS, EDITORS-PUBLISHERS,
256 and 258 Saint-Paul Street.

PREFATORY NOTE.

In publishing this translation of a somewhat hurried piece of work, my purpose is not to seek for success and applause among the English-speaking Canadian public. It is not either to convince them, as may be necessary with the French-Canadians, that Imperialism is a living reality. But this lecture gave rise to some press-comments; my words have been distorted at leisure by a large number of party organs. This, I am used to; and it would leave me perfectly indifferent, were it not for the false conclusions that were drawn because of the welcome extended by my fellow-countrymen to what is termed my "disloyal, anti-English utterances".

If I fail in bringing over to my views any of my English-speaking readers, I hope, at least, to dispel the erroneous notions which they may have gathered from so-called reports of my lecture.

I may be allowed to quote here a paragraph from a letter I sent to one of those newspapers.

> I don't pretend to any kind of infallibility in my views on Imperialism. I have the greatest respect for all those who uphold honestly and sincerely ideas and principles to which I am sincerely and honestly opposed. I claim the right of fighting them with the same liberty that they enjoy themselves. You may say that I have thrown ridicule on the apostles of Imperialism, their words and their deeds. Well, one fights with such weapons as he has at his hand. I have heard many an imperialist state loudly that Gladstone was an old "humbug," and his policy the cause of all troubles and disasters. Have not the anti-imperialists an equal right to say that the results of Mr. Chamberlain's policy are not such as to be boasted about? Why should I be made to appear as a disloyal Anglophobist because I have chosen to remain faithful to ideals that led British opinion for centuries and that are still upheld in Great Britain by many of her most learned and respectable citizens?
>
> The Empire "I held up to ridicule" is the one which the new school is endeavouring to build up; but the bulk of my argument went to prove that the decentralised British Empire of old days, the only one of its kind, was far superior to the Spanish, Portuguese and French colonial empires, and in fact, the best that ever was—as the British political constitution is the best means of internal government.

Further than this, I offer no apology—nor need I do so.

Those Imperialists who persist in taxing such sentiments with disloyalty, and denying to any Canadian, whether of French or British extraction, the right of holding and expressing opinions contrary to the apparent sentiment of the majority, prove themselves untrue to the best of British traditions. Not only do they endeavour to upset all the principles which have been so far acknowledged as the basis of British power and prestige, but they even try to stifle free and fair discussion.

I am prepared to go much further than the Imperialists, and admit that they may be right in assuming that the time has come for a radical change

in the constitution of the Empire. But the very manner in which they accept, or rather refuse to accept, any discussion of their theories, slandering and disfiguring every contradictory statement, is a strong admission of weakness. The most beneficient social reforms, the most needed political changes, cannot but acquire strength and value from a broad discussion. What has given British institutions their most valuable characteristics, if not the very fact that they were freely and thoroughly discussed and even opposed to the bitter end?

Since delivering this lecture, I have compiled a mass of documents, extracts of which are appended to this pamphlet. With a view to presenting these extracts under a more digestible form, I have divided them into chapters, the headings of which are self-explanatory. Those documents, the reader is invited carefully to study; and from their perusal he may gather what Imperialism means to us.

British Imperialism — as opposed to British democracy, to British traditions, to British grandeur—is a lust for land-grabbing and military dominion. Born of the overgrowth of British power, bred by that stupid and blatant sense of pride known as *Jingoism*, it delights in high-sounding formulas: — "*Britannia, rule the waves!*"... "*Britons never shall be slaves!*"... "*Trade follows the Flag*"..., "*What we have, we hold!*"...; to this last axiom, the Prime-Minister of Ontario has added: — "*and what we don't have, we take*" — which is now supplemented by public good sense by: "*when we can.*"

Having undertaken more responsibilities than she is able to stand, surrounded as she is by hostile or indifferent nations, the new Britain of Mr. Chamberlain is in sore need of soldiers and sailors to prop the fabric raised by her frantic ambition. Being actually denuded of troops at home, she turns in distress to her colonies. Realising as they do that without practising evasion they cannot possibly achieve their purpose, British rulers of to-day resort to deceit and bribery with colonial statesmen; they lull the credulity and inflame the jingo feelings of the people of the colonies. Under miscellaneous names and variegated unifoms — Royal Rifles, Mounted Infantry, Strathcona Horse, Yeomanry — they extort from us whatever they may get in the shape of human material for their army; even if they have to dangle before our eyes a few paltry advantages to be thrown as a sop to us whenever we get tired of this deadly game.

In short, MILITARY CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE COLONIES TO GREAT BRITAIN, in men and treasure, but mainly in men, constitute British Imperialism.

There is one feature of this movement to which I call the special attention of my English-speaking readers. It is the duplicity in tactics with which it is carried on. In England, the taxpayer hears only of the great benefits to be gained by the Mother country: she is going to be helped with colonial contributions to her army and navy — not only in time of

need, but as a permanent military system that will save her from the dread of conscription. In the colonies, we are told that our free and voluntary sacrifices in the cause of the Empire in South Africa are bound to bring us incalculable advantages in trade and industry, in immigration from the British Isles, etc.

In Canada, the same double game is carried on by politicians of all shades. In the English-speaking provinces, both parties run for the prize of "loyalty", — each side claiming the credit of having done the most for Great Britain. Of sole devotion to Canadian interests, we hear no more. The Tories have discarded in awe the famous exclamation of their greatest leader: "*So much the worse for British connection!*" while no Liberal would dare repeat with Mr. Laurier in 1891: "*I prefer the American dollar to the British shilling.*" The only point in real dispute between both parties is which of the two will eat the biggest piece of the jingo pie. All this, of course, does not prevent them from selling Canada wholesale to American railway magnates.

In Quebec, the same comedians show themselves under totally different wigs and costumes. Like Maître-Jacques, of Molière, the moment they cross the provincial border they truck the coachman's livery for the cook's apron. It is no longer a question of which party has done more for Great Britain, but, the less done, the greater credit claimed. "The government are selling us to Great Britain," shout the Conservatives: "put us back in power and save the country!" — "There is no such thing as imperialism," retort the Liberals; "it is but an empty dream, kept up by a few eccentrics. We have only permitted a few men to go to Africa; had our opponents been in office, many more men would have gone and more money would have been spent. Keep our illustrious compatriot, Laurier, in power and be safe from Tory imperialism!"

This double game cannot last — but the sooner stopped, the better for Canada, for Great Britain and the Empire. Here, it must fatally bring ill-feeling and serious clash between the two races, led as they are, by the same men, in two opposite directions. As regards British connexion, it will be seriously endangered the moment the people of Great Britain and the colonists find out that delusive and contradictory expectations have been bred in them.

These are the two dangers of Imperialism, which, for my part, as a Canadian, I wish my country to avoid.

Were I the disloyal Anglophobist that I am now well reputed to be, I could well afford to rest in silence and joy. A few years more of this drifting, and racial feuds will develop that will drag us by the most painful but the surest ways towards annexation to the United States.

HENRI BOURASSA,

PAPINEAUVILLE, January, 1902.

GREAT BRITAIN AND CANADA.

Bonds between Great Britain and Canada.

Our destinies are bound up with the destinies of Great Britain and, to a large extent, with those of the United States. Of course, I am not referring here to the political link which binds us to the British Crown: were it not for the many ligaments from which it derives its whole strength, British connection would, indeed, amount to very little.

From Great Britain, we hold the constitution under which we live — an offspring of British maturity. How could we thoroughly understand that constitution, how could we master the secret of its vitality, and foresee what fruit it may bear, without knowing the old parent-tree, a mere branch of which it is? Moreover, upon that constitution we have grafted certain elements, borrowed from the American constitution, and copied from such portions of the work of the Adams, Madisons and Hamiltons as most materially differ from British institutions: that is, our federative form of constitutional government.

The majority of the Canadian people are of British extraction. Their implantation into the American soil being of recent date, they are less acclimatised than we are on this continent. In the life of the Mother country they participate more than we do. In short, they are more English than we are French; and occasionally, even more English than the native of Lancashire, or Somersetshire.

Of British and American capital our industries, our trade, our financial institutions, our means of communication were born, and upon the same capital they still feed and grow and develop. Therefore, in its origin, as well as in its operations, our industrial life is either English, or American.

Materialism is the chief characteristic of our age. On this continent especially, financial interests are overwhelmingly predominant: Intelligence has to pick up the crumbs that Wealth allows to fall from its table. Here, in Canada, we are still in the prime of life, and because of the eccentricities of our territorial overgrowth, we cry out for some food that will build up our nerves and tissues

and brace up the forces of our system. Therefore, our future will be determined by our material interests, in spite of the outbursts of enthusiasm and patriotic sentiments which stir up both races, one after the other.

Though few and far between, those fits of passion, with the English element, are marked by more convulsive vehemence than with the French, and are more pregnant with far-reaching consequences. If it can be truly said that the onward march of nations is hastened during their moments of frenzy, these acute crises only make for the influence of English-speaking Canadians who have already in their favour the strength of numbers and of capital. Were they to-morrow, from a sense of their material interests, to draw closer to the United States, those very same voices would be heard singing the glories of the "Stars and Stripes", which but yesterday were hurraying themselves hoarse over the visit of the heir to the throne of England.

Placed as we are between Great Britain, who holds us, and the United States, who is waiting to gobble us up, we are ignorant of the history of both nations. Of Cæsar's and Napoleon's campaigns we know more than we do about the movements of the two nations with whom our destinies are in the present, and are likely to be in the future still more inextricably, blended. We have at most a few ready-made opinions pinned upon the turning-points in our history where our interests and the interests of those two great nations have clashed: the cession of our territory to England, the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Rebellion of 1837, the Union of the two Canadas with the conquest of responsible government, Confederation, the Secession war with the Washington Treaty, the Transvaal war. While reviewing, from near or far, these various events, we rather instinctively side either with or against England, either with or against the United States. But the political tendencies of those two nations, and their moving causes and consequences, and — what is still more important to us — the forces of attraction and repulsion brought to bear upon us, we utterly neglect to study and watch.

To the subordination under which we have until now been living this strange inertia is no doubt due. In vain do our Canadian imperialists proclaim that we have attained the status of a nation: the fact is that we have never yet exercised one of the essential prerogatives of national sovereignty: I mean the conduct of and the control over our foreign relations. Trusting to the wisdom, so conspicuous down till the present outburst of jingoism, of British statemanship, we have relied upon Great Britain for the management of our international relations, and as a result, foreign politics and even British politics are utterly unknown to us. We are

then as ill-prepared as is possible for the task which confronts us—that of directing our own course, and steering clear of dangerous rocks, as well as keeping our rulers on the right track.

By this conviction I have been guided in selecting the subject of this lecture, and I may say that for the last two years this preoccupation has been the guiding principle of my public life.

Leaving aside all considerations of American politics, I merely propose to approach the evolution of British Imperialism—a field of research wide enough in itself.

To deal with the past, present and future relations of Great Britain and Canada, so as not to give a mere synoptical table, is to review the history of the British Empire, or at least to trace the development of the imperialist instinct in the British nation. This evolution I shall merely sketch in outline.

Genesis of the Imperialist Instinct.

Imperialism is no novel tendency in England, nor is it of modern growth in the world. Like all social movements, it is rooted in the very nature of man.

There are, in human nature, two ever warring instincts: individualism, by which man strives to prevail over the community and to free himself from laws, taxation and mutual responsibilities; and communism, through which men endeavour to secure by their combined efforts a larger sum of power, a quota of which is to be shared by every one. Of the latter instinct were born such groups as family, tribe, nation, empire, and also association, business partnership, trust, — in short, all social agglomerations the members of which give up more or less of their individuality for the achievement of an object, either moral or material, which no single individual, through his own unaided efforts, could ever attain.

In a proper balance between those two instincts lies the best guarantee of individual liberty and national prosperity.

In the political sphere, the only one we are concerned with here, it may be said that this spirit of association and expansion must be proportioned to the intellectual and physical powers of each race and adjust itself to the peculiar conditions of the country where it

has developed its hereditary instincts. Should it try to overstep such limits, a nation would overtax its powers and temperament, thereby imposing upon its members additional self-sacrifices. When carried away by a sense of pride, or by enthusiasm or despair, a nation may consent to such sacrifices; but individual reaction is bound to follow, and the violence of that reaction corresponding to the previous over-tension, the association is brought back within its normal limits.

Such is the genesis of all empires from the very dawn of ages; and the various stages of their life may, like those of man's life, be described in these few words: birth, growth, expansion, decay, death.

What stage of her journey has England now reached, and how long are we to dog the footsteps and follow in the wake of the Mother-country? Such is the problem on which, without presuming to solve it, I am going to offer a few remarks.

Early growth of England.

CONQUEST OF SCOTLAND AND IRELAND.

Like all other nations, England possessed, from its very origin, instincts favourable and unfavourable alike to the growth of Imperialism. With her, as with other nation-states, the unfavourable instinct was the first to develop and was long predominant. In England, the imperialistic tendencies were of much slower growth than elsewhere; they may prove harder to cope with and result more disastrously to the nation.

The first natural limit of a nation is its geographical environment, and resulting therefrom, the unity of race. The geographical outlines of Great Britain were well defined; national unity was a necessity: she had either to conquer Scotland or to be conquered by her. Conquer England did, and it was the great effort of the early stage of her growth. The assimilation of the Scottish race was extremely profitable to the English people.

Historians devote more attention to England's continental wars, because these wars did really set in motion greater forces, and were pregnant with far-reaching results to Europe and to the civilised world. But from a social point of view, these struggles were not the desire of the English people. They were brought about by a train of political accidents, such as the Norman succession, the alliance of the English Crown with the Houses of Britany, of Guienne and of Anjou.

True to say, most of the wars waged during the Middle-Ages and throughout a long period of modern history may be assigned to similar causes. But, with other nations, feudal alliances, and the conflicts they involved, enabled peoples and races to find their proper level. The cause of princes became the cause of communities. And after a succession of victories and defeats, of conquests and evictions, each of the continental nations was allotted its due share of territory, of greatness and prosperity.

Despite her many achievements, England was finally compelled to return within her own borders; and not until she had checked the lust of territorial acquisition and recalled the boundaries of her conquests from beyond the channel, did her greatness actually dawn. The time had not yet come for her Imperialism to develop the growth of its latent germs.

Of the fruits of this first fit of military domination, the violent and arbitrary conquest of Ireland is all that is now left to England. A deadly germ it may yet prove to be, and one which will be most potent in bringing about the downfall of Great Britain.

Apart from this blunder, an outcome of the vindictive spirit stirred up by the Reformation, the England of Elizabeth and of Cromwell ran her normal course: an intense development of activity within, to which the discovery of coal, and the utilisation of steam, were soon to give a fresh impetus; a foreign policy of neutrality, except with respect to such interventions as were meant to keep the balance between the continental powers, and prevent any of them becoming a menace to her own trade and security.

Expansion of the English People.

But the moment came when the very cause which had compelled England to return within her natural limits, that is, her geographical isolation, forcibly determined her expansion and gave Imperialism a new life under a new form.

From the growth of her industry and the increase of her population, her inhabitants had to seek new lands, and her traders, foreign markets. To this circumstance the growth and development of the colonising and maritime instinct of the British people are due; and even then accidental agencies were needed to stimulate that movement.

There is nothing more unhistorical than the legend which attributes to the Englishman an inherent aptitude for colonisation and maritime pursuits. Owing to his stay-at-home propensities and his love of comfort, he feels a reluctance to go and settle abroad. From his slow temperament and uninventive mind, as from his insularity,

he cannot adjust himself to the social and economic environments of other nations, unable as he is to understand them. Feeling uncomfortable abroad, he makes himself disliked. Is there under heavens one single spot where a born Englishman has endeared himself to his neighbours and reciprocated their love? This remark I make in no spirit of disparagement, those characteristics of the stock being a mere result of atavism. When you meet him in his proper environment, at home, the Englishman evinces qualities, political, social and individual, which make of him a most affable and estimable man. To sum up, I might say that as a host, he proves the most charming, and as a neighbour, the most execrable of all men.

This lack of adaptability prevented English traders and colonists from expanding in Europe. They went out across far off seas, to seek new lands where they could live, every man by himself and be his own master, and establish trading-posts free from the competition of European industry, then superior to their own.

As I have just stated, this movement was hastened by accidental agencies. Of these the chief one was the result of the religious quarrels which brought Flemish and French Huguenot mechanics to England. More skilled and intelligent than the native labourers, these new-comers gave a strong impetus to British trade and industry. Within the realm, identical religious controversies, coupled with the dynastic contests from which sprang England's modern constitution, threw a large number of her inhabitants on the shores of America.

And thus was born the great British Empire.

Growth of the British Empire.

ITS SUPERIORITY.

I am not going into a historical review of that wonderful expansion which soon covered one half of the New-World and a large portion of the Old. Let it suffice to invite attention to a fact which of the British Empire makes an essentially different organism from all the empires of old, or of those which grew alongside of it.

All Empires, modern or ancient, were born of some political or military idea. They were the outcome of conquests or treaties contrived, undertaken, conducted or achieved by conquerors, statesmen, rulers and diplomatists. And history bears witness to the fact that, as a rule, those political structures collapsed with their authors or their successors, whether single or collective.

The British Empire, on the contrary, was built up and developed like the British constitution, outside of any general theory or preconcerted plan of action, without government help and often contrary to the wishes of the Crown and the sense of the people.

Go back to the history of the thirteen American colonies, to that of India, of Australia or New-Zealand, and you will find that those countries were built up by English settlers and shop-keepers, by political or sectarian refugees and discharged convicts. Of these some were in quest of peace and liberty, others, of wealth; some had turned in anger from the parent's roof, cursing the men and institutions of their country; others, indifferent to all the rest, cared only for pelf. To none of these pioneers did it ever occur that he was endowing his country with an empire.

What a striking and typical contrast with the schemes, the masterstrokes which prompted the conquests of Caesar, Charlemagne, Charles V, Frederick, Napoleon and Bismark, and with the enterprises of Isabella of Spain, Richelieu, and Colbert!

But all human undertakings — and here I refer to such undertakings as have promises of life in them, and enter into the plans of Providence — seem to be governed by a mysterious law in virtue of which cause and effect, means and end, are kept in balance. Born of lofty ideals, their natural tendency is to sink below their level, in the very process of their growth; while those of a low origin tend to rise above their level and prosper.

With man, instinct, rather than reason, is the controlling principle. That form of government is the best which grows and shapes itself to the temperament of the nation; that nation is the strongest which develops in accordance, not with the theories of philosophers and politicians, even were they men of genius, but in harmony with the requirements of its character; and they are the true statesmen who, in ruling the state, are guided not by their own philosophical conceptions, but by the instinct of the people.

That empire-builders are bound to commit serious blunders goes without saying. Such is the case when wretched settlers are transferred to countries with an unfriendly soil, under a deadly climate, who, from sheer disappointment and the wreck of their hopes, block the settlement of the country. Such is the case again, when colonies are founded in the neighbourhood of warlike nations, and compelled by the parent-state to maintain armies of occupation. Now, that soldiery, those hirelings so to say, tyranising over the colony and hampering its progress, only come back home to scatter, like so many wrecks of humanity, over the Mother country, no longer fit for anything, and but too often bent on mischief.

Left to their own enterprise, colonists will look for a rich soil, a favourable climate and congenial neighbours. From the urgency

of self-protection, the only warlike spirit will be bred in their breasts that may atone for the horrors of war: the necessity of defending one's family, one's home, one's inheritance. As a nation is brutified and involved by militarism, so it is ennobled by that innate spirit. Traders also, self-interest being their guiding principle, prove to be good pioneers; they run their ships towards lands where a buying and selling trade may be developed, that is, towards rich, prosperous, peace-loving countries.

Colonial Policy of England.

As I have already stated, it was in defiance of the leaders of the nation, that most of the colonies of Great Britain were founded; and the settlers had no end of trouble in getting the Mother country to acknowledge and welcome their existence.

Long did the East India Company, at their own risk, exercise all the prerogatives of sovereignty — fighting, ruling, administering justice and public affairs, practising bribery and robbery — before the British government could be induced to extend its constitutional authority over the acts and the officials of that powerful corporation, and raise the British flag over the territories which they had conquered, occupied, or protected.

The trial of Warren Hastings stands in history as a witness to the frame of mind of the law-makers of those times. Read over again the admirable pages in which Macauly has, with a masterly hand, recorded as in plates of bronze, that memorable event, and behold what took place less than a century later; listen to the rabble and the swell stock-jobbers of London cheering, as a hero of the Empire, Cecil Rhodes—more guilty, from his own avowal, than was the Nabob himself. Hastings was but an official of a commercial corporation; in no way was the honour of the Crown implicated by his doings, which from the corruption of the country and the age, as well as from the wild and bloody anarchy into which India had fallen, may in a large measure be accounted for. Rhodes, a prime minister of a British colony, a privy councillor of England, honored as he was with the confidence of Her Majesty's advisers in London, breaks the plighted word of his sovereign, commits an act condemned by the Law of Nations. True, he is turned out of power by the electorate of his colony, but he still enjoys the confidence of the Queen whose majesty he has sullied, while at the colonial secretary's own hand he receives a certificate of honour (1).

(1) "I am perfectly convinced that, while the fault of Mr. Rhodes is about as great a fault "as a politician or a statesman can commit, there has been nothing proved — and, in my "opinion, there exists nothing — which affects Mr. Rhodes' personal position as a man of "honour." – From Mr. Chamberlain's speech in the House of Commons. (See London *Times*, July 27th, 1897.)

In those two events the development of British imperialism is illustrated to perfection. In England, a century ago, the standard of honour, both in private life and in public life, was below the present standard. In the records of those days, is to be found shamelessly paraded to the broad daylight the most shocking depravity. But the sense of government was sound. Improving territorial organisation was made more of than acquiring new lands, mainly by such means as might have involved risks of war for the nation.

Pitt and Wellington.

The younger Pitt was the embodiment of that idea. Like Walpole, he was a champion of peace, of political reform and financial reorganisation. When war was forced upon him, he only yielded a reluctant consent to that dire necessity, after allowing France to humble his ambassadors and foment rebellion in Ireland. Refusing to commit his country to a policy of military adventures and conquests, he preferred to supply his allies with the sinews of war, that they might buy soldiers and arms. He realised, as Napoleon, did that England was a nation of shop-keepers, and that she had better be saddled with taxation than inoculated with the virus of militarism . Not until after his death did the lust for military glory take hold of his country and pave the way for Wellington and his armies. The great general I admire, less on account of his easily won victories over an exhausted enemy than for his tenacity of purpose, his patience, his generosity, his magnanimity, his humaneness. But England could well have spared the great Duke; and she would fare better to-day had her government adhered to Pitt's policy of keeping her people at home, in the colonies and on her ships, while subsidising the continental nations until they got tired with slaughtering each other.

Notwithstanding the huge and clumsy monuments which, in all the cities of the kingdom, proclaim the glory of the victor of Waterloo, I persist in seeing in William Pitt the great man of modern England (1). While he reluctantly bore the weight of Bonaparte's unbounded ambition, he reorganised England's navy; when forced to create an enormous national debt, he regulated its management and redemption; he reconstructed the government of India; he

(1) Even Gladstone, to my mind, does not rank above Pitt in this respect. As a world-statesman Gladstone is unquestionably a greater man than Pitt. His policy is more ideal, more eclectic, more human. From his politics every nation may learn useful lessons. Gladstone belongs to humanity. Pitt is thoroughly English: his methods are suitable to England alone, but they suit her to perfection.

paved the way for electoral reform and catholic emancipation. In short, he ruled England in accord with her national temperament; he set her in her normal course, and forced, so to speak, his successors both whig and tory to follow along the main lines of his policy.

The American Colonies.

Let us go back to the American colonies. Here again crops up the same reluctance to territorial acquisition. However, the prosperity of the colonies and their commercial intercourse with the traders of the Mother country, finally compelled the attention of the home government, and, as was the case with India, brought about official recognition. This resulted in the creation of the several colonial constitutions whereby His Britannic Majesty, while accepting the allegiance of his subjects over-seas, left them to bear the burden of self-government, taxation and defence.

From a strange obliteration of historical sense, which often leads to a confusion of the ideas of cause and effect, we have come to the conclusion that these constitutions were the work of the far-seeing genius of England. As a matter of fact, a provision which imposed upon the colonies almost all the burdens and responsabilities of their own government, was, in the mind of her statesmen, the onerous consideration for which the colonists were granted the signal privilege of being admitted to the rank of His Majesty's subjects.

Upon that principle of decentralisation,— a principle quite novel, and essentially antagonistic to the paternalism of the colonial empires of Spain, Portugal and France,— was built up the British Empire, and the day came when that little island to the north of Europe ruled the widest area of scattered lands that ever acknowledged one single authority. It is then no paradox to state that of the anti-imperialistic sense of the English people was born the British Empire, and that in the strength of that instinct lies the secret of its maintenance (1).

---

(1) Burke has given full expression to this idea in his speech in favour of conciliation with the American colonies : "...when I know that *the colonies in general owe little or nothing* " *to any care of ours*, and that they are not squeezed into this happy form by the constraints " of watchful and suspicious government, but that, through a *wise and salutary neglect*, a " generous nature has been suffered to take her own way to perfection — when I reflect " upon these effects— when I see *how profitable they have been to us*, I feel all the pride of " power sink, and all presumption in the wisdom of human contrivances melt and die away " within me. My rigour relents. I pardon something to the spirit of liberty."

Germs of new Imperialism.

However, the first germs of Imperialism were soon to develop, and, possibly, this was bound to happen. It is with nations who colonise before making conquests as with those who make conquests before colonising: the moment comes when they are confronted by an identical situation, with a colonial empire for the defence of which they have to provide.

From the expansion of British power in India resulted a standing army and a civil service, both of which proved unmitigated social evils by attracting British youth towards militarism and bureaucracy. In order to market off the products of that country, Great Britain, later on, waged her Chinese wars, and developed her odious opium trade. I need not refer to that plutocracy devoid of all scrupules and traditions, to those corrupt nabobs, who debased public ideals and put a price on national representation. Of this curse England succeeded in ridding herself.

In America, the New-England colonists had at last forced upon the Mother country the conquest of New-France; and with a view to protecting the route to India, Great Britain felt bound to annex to her dominions the Dutch colony of the Cape. To the Irish question were thus added two fresh racial problems, than which there are none more irritating, none more fraught with dangers and more difficult to solve.

The American Revolution.

The British government attempted to force the American colonies to share in the costs of their own defence and of the Seven-Years' war. From this first move towards political imperialism resulted the momentous event which gave birth to one of the greatest of modern world-powers. Such a sudden reaction benefited both Great Britain and Canada. Realising the wish of Lord Chatham, the American Revolution checked the progress of imperialism in Great Britain (1). It ushered in the era of our political emancipation and constitutional liberty.

---

(1) The speech delivered on that question by the great statesman, in the House of Lords, on the 18th of November 1777, is worth reading over, — the more so as it has so close an application to the South-African crisis. Anxious as he was that England should keep her American colonies, Chatham nevertheless said: "If I were an American, as I am "an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I never would lay down "my arms — never — never — never!" Clearly, were Chatham still living, he would be denounced as a traitor and a pro-Boer!

England's reluctance to grant the Canadian provinces an autonomy which the American colonies had long enjoyed has often been, with some, a matter of astonishment. This apparent contradiction is easily cleared up if we bear in mind that England's sole purpose, as I have just stated, in bestowing such a large measure of liberty upon the Plantations, was to be relieved of cumbersome responsibilities. On the other hand, the rebellion of the Anglo-American settlers, while resulting from the encroachments of the government of George III, Grenville and Lord North was wrongly imputed to the working of colonial self government. No wonder then that we were denied privileges that had been conceded to the other colonies with the sole view to safeguarding the interests of the Mother-country.

To be rightly understood, the relations of Great Britain to the colonies must be studied in the light of this constant fact: that the exclusive interest of Great Britain was the main spring which moved her statesmen, whenever they had to modify the colonial status.

Emancipation of Canada.

After half a century of struggles you are familiar with, the acute stage of which was reached in 1837, we finally secured responsible government and provincial autonomy.

Since then, peacefully we have run our course, losing sight of English politics. Causes of friction becoming fewer and slighter, the exact notion of the quarrels of the past we have even allowed to get obscured. God forbid that I should re-open wounds that are healed over! But to my mind, to allow history to be superseded by legend, mainly when history tends to repeat itself under a new form, would be a dangerous thing.

It is growing into a fashion with our public men to dwell upon the debt of eternal gratitude they think we owe the motherland for the generosity, the disinterestedness, the magnanimity displayed in the granting of our liberties. "The past is a guarantee of the future; the struggles of the first half of last century are no more to return," they say; "never shall England, noble-minded as she is, dream of taking away from us one single atom of the autonomy so fully and so unreservedly conceded to us."

To the statesmen who so nobly and so manfully struggled, and with such unflinching tenacity, for the triumph of those principles of liberty, decentralisation, respect to minorities, which ever were in the past the glory and the strength of Great Britain we do, indeed, owe—and England and the whole world with us owe—a debt of gra-

titude. I spoke a moment ago of Lord Wellington. What a noble spectacle it was to see this old soldier, hardened by fifty years of military discipline, of campaigns and battles, standing up on the floor of the House of Lords and entering his protest against the bill for the Union of the two Canadas, and thereby constituting himself — unconsciously perhaps — the champion of a weak offspring of the old French parent-tree, at which he had struck so many a hard blow!

Yes, indeed, to such men as Gosford, Ellenborough, Brougham, Peel, Grey, Bright, Gladstone — to all those who, few though they be, were, out of a pure love of liberty, instrumental in securing and preserving to us political freedom — our admiration and our gratitude are due without stint.

But history and geography should be respected. Do not let us forget that if the persistent efforts of those great men bore fruit, it was after years and years of a laborious incubation; that they had to contend against formidable opponents, some of whom attempted to blot out the French element, while others, the progenitors of the Imperialists of today, aimed at the enslavement of the colony. In the views of Lord Durham himself, one of the most liberal-minded statesmen of his days, the Union of the two Canadas meant the absorption of the French element. We have loosened the knot, I grant, and made the best of the situation that confronted us; but I fail to see why we should put upon a pedestal the statesman who planned the extinction of our nationality, after the methods of painless tooth-drawing practised by the quack doctor. In plain English, baseness is but another name for gratitude of that kind.

The victory of our champions was then but a partial victory, won through particular circumstances altogether foreign to love and generosity: the distance of the colony, the near neighbourhood of the United States, the cost and dangers of military domination, such were the circumstances which conspired to win over to our side the votes of many noble Lords and Commoners, and brought home to the English people that conciliation was the best policy.

As Mr. John Morley recently remarked, the tax-gatherer is the best of school-masters. Should England, made wiser by the wonderful resistance of the Boers and the increasing disaffection of the Cape colonists, be compelled to make peace in Africa, would the heroes of this war of giants owe a great debt of gratitude to Lord Salisbury and Mr. Chamberlain, or to Sir Edward Grey who is quite willing that they should be hanged, if only in due form, or even yet to the Canadian government who have become the accomplices of the British authorities and approved of such hangings, burnings and devastations as vividly bring to mind Sir John Colborne's deeds, who was known here under the name of the "old firebrand"?

A new chapter is opened, in the history of our country, which alters the situation so favourable to us of sixty years ago, and this, I think I may here point out without violating my oath of allegiance. The champions of our liberties are no more; their disciples, reduced to impotency, have been succeeded in the British cabinet by adherents of a new school of thought, the direct descendants of the very men who had planned our enslavement. To sum up, I tell you in the language of our neighbours: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Cobden and his School.

The campaign of Cobden, with the triumph of free-trade, was another timely circumstance which strengthened our new-born liberties. An immense impetus was given to British trade, and the former artisan of Manchester became the prophet of Great Britain. To Cobden, Imperialism, both military and political, was abhorrent; colonial expansion he distrusted. In the remote possessions of England he foresaw a source of dangers abroad and within; in the infinitude of colonial and foreign questions engrossing the attention of Parliament, an impediment to social reform; in the necessity of an army and a war fleet, a bold defiance of foreign powers, and an insuperable obstacle to the fulfilment of his two most cherished dreams, free-trade and universal peace.

The endorsation of his system by the English people he failed to secure, but he succeeded in spreading enough of his doctrine to enlist their support in favour of a policy of complete colonial decentralisation as an initial step towards secession. His comparison —after Turgot—of the ripe fruit dropping from the tree, became the familiar image by which rulers and subjects realised the Empire. The colonies were given to understand that they were to be self-reliant and self-supporting, and that whensoever they thought fit to sever their connection with the motherland, no obstacle would be put in the way.

Revival of Imperialism.

While we were enjoying an absolute security, and getting used to this large measure of independence, the remembrance of the heavy price paid for our liberty began to vanish. Out of colonial expansion were soon to grow new germs of that political and military Imperialism, which had been checked by the American Revolution, and retarted by the influence of Cobden.

A further expansion of British power to the North of India was a sequel to the Indian mutiny, and resulted later on in the Afghanistan war—a forerunner to ever-recurring troubles with Russia. From the occupation of Egypt sprang the war in the Soudan, a fresh seed of friction with France.

In the eyes of Gladstone, these enterprises were of ill augury. That he was not the only one to share these views, has been clearly shown of late by Mr. Cecil Rhodes' strange revelations.

South Africa.

It was in the South African soil, however, that the causes were to germinate through which England was to launch out into military adventures.

Did Bismarck truly forecast that South Africa was to be the grave of British power? That he who carved out of the entrails of Austria and France the most warlike empire ever known to Europe since Napoleon, should have foreseen the danger to England from increasing militarism, would indeed sound very strange. He was, however, clear-sighted enough to understand that a policy, which suited such an homogeneous and compact state as Germany, might prove fatal to a motley and widely scattered empire like Greater Britain. It was not, I presume, out of humanitarian considerations, or a regard for international morality, that the man who cynically mocked at "professor" Gladstone, made such a forecast.

I am not going into a review of the history of that unhappy country: the stirring events which are now unfolding themselves have made it familiar to you. But it furnishes so striking an illustration of my argument that a few pages may be summarised here, in which the respective methods and results of both English political schools are wonderfully pictured.

It is a characteristic feature of the birth of Cape Colony that it is the only real offspring of Imperialism. The conquest of India and of Canada, the acquisition of the other colonies, resulted from events more or less foreign to the will of the English nation. But the Cape was acquired and held by Britain for political purposes and as a strategical point on the route to India. Given back for a while to Holland, it was claimed again by England. An attempt was first made to rule the colony from London by the sword. Thence resulted the rebellion of the Dutch Colonists, put down by the sword and halter, the emigration of the Dutch people to the north, and the birth of the two small republics which, true to the word of old President Kruger, one of the last survivors of the Great Trek, are to-day staggering humanity.

To the Afrikanders, on both sides of the Vaal and Orange, the victory of the Cobden school and the advent of Lord Grey to the Colonial office proved as beneficial as they did to Canada. The independence of both republics was acknowledged. In Cape Colony the inhabitants of Dutch stock were allowed the free exercise of their political and civil rights. Pacified by the emancipation of their countrymen of the Transvaal and the Free State, the Cape Boers accepted as loyally as we did British institutions. A new generation rose up among them, an educated class, which, while they remained deeply attached to the native soil and clung to their old traditions, drew somewhat closer to the Anglo-African element. Sympathy was of quicker growth and more deeply-seated there than it was here, no doubt because the Boers having no Universities of their own, the Dutch youth who desired to obtain a first-rate education was obliged to go to the schools and Universities of the Mother-country to get diplomas which he could not secure in his own native land: he came back to the colony, having acquired the language and the manners of his English-speaking neighbours, and above all imbued with those feelings of esteem and confidence which well-bred and educated Englishmen are wont to inspire in those who have enjoyed their hospitality (1).

From the awakening of the old spirit of Imperialism, with Disraeli and Carnarvon in the Cabinet, and Shepstone in Africa, peace and harmony were disturbed and the old feuds re-kindled. The unwarrantable annexation of the Transvaal, in 1879, caused the Boers of the North to take the field; and henceforth, although they were not continually under arms, hatred and mistrust poisoned their minds for ever. The rebound in Cape Colony was instantaneous. For such is the inexorable law of the history of South Africa: Great Britain's respect for her pledges to the Free State and Transvaal Boers is the unerring barometer by which the loyalty of the Cape and Natal Boers ever may be measured. Enormous and but too frequent — alas! for the peace and honour of England, — have been the variations of this barometer. As Lord Roberts rightly said, South-Africa is the land of falsehood. As a matter of fact, British Colonial Secretaries and High-Commissioners have sown in the African soil such a copious seed of imposture that it is no wonder English generals should find it next to impossible to reap the laurels of victory.

The defeat of Majuba Hill and Gladstone's return to power brought the imperialistic schemes to a temporary stand-still. The generosity and lofty spirit displayed by the Grand Old Man in dealing with that question are now sneered at by the eminent sta-

(1) See *Appendices*, ch IX, page CXXXII.

tesmen who so noisily called out all the reserves of the Empire to crush the Boers. A war expenditure of half a billion pounds sterling, another prospective expenditure of five hundred millions, seventy thousand men disabled, 200,000 soldiers held in check, the impossibility to find any more recruits, the stupidity of the British staff exhibited to the world, the military prestige of Great Britain destroyed (1), with a ubiquitous foe at the very doors of Cape Town — and all this, mark well, two years after the declaration of hostilities, one year after the war had been proclaimed by the Crown Ministers of England to be over, three months after Mr. Chamberlain had decreed with a high hand that the companions of Botha and Dewet were no longer to be considered as belligerents: — all this, I say, may be very glorious for Great Britain, all this may make for Empire and for the interests of Canada; but I still hold that the results of Gladstone's policy compare favourably with Mr. Chamberlain's masterstrokes, backed as they are by the eloquence of all his Colonial sycophants.

The Gladstone Cabinet, 1880-1885.

THE EMPIRE AT ITS ZENITH.

Of the time of the second Gladstone administration it may truly be said that Great Britain was then at the zenith of her power. India was peaceful, the possession of Egypt, secure; Australia and New-Zealand were entering upon an era of unprecedented prosperity; Canada was about to put at the disposal of the Empire her transcontinental railway; and the great statesman, whom popular favour was so soon to forsake, was going to grapple with the most disturbing factor of British politics, a problem bristling with difficulties: the emancipation of Ireland. This obstacle, which time had only rendered more difficult to cope with, Gladstone's genius failed to overcome; his political prestige vanished in the attempt; he had to give up his post, and soon disappeared from the stage of this world, before his own country had realised the loftiness and wisdom of his views. He was the last survivor of the great struggles of Cobden and the anti-imperialist school (2). On his favourite disciple, Lord Rosebery, his successor in the chronological order, devolved the leadership.

---

(1) See Lord Rosebery's speech at Chatam : *Appendices*, page XLI.

(2) Of which he was not a follower at first. Curiously enough, Lord Rosebery is passing through the very opposite evolution which brought Gladstone from the deepest toryism to the verge of radicalism.

A peculiar cross between a statesman and a sceptical dilettante, Lord Rosebery soon understood that he lacked the necessary vigour to keep within party lines the incoherent elements of his parliamentary majority. Strange to say, he is now evolving into a full-fledged Imperialist, although, at the time, in a valedictory address to his political friends, he did sum up, in that clear, elegant and plausible style of his, the dangers which imperialism conjures up.

Disruption of the Liberal Party.

The advocacy of Irish Home rule it was which occasioned the split in the Liberal party. But deep-seated and numerous — to quote Mr. Chamberlain himself — were the underlying causes of friction. Party cleavage led up to the formation of the Tory-Unionist party, the most conspicuous and the most active member of which Mr. Chamberlain soon became. This new group seemed the least qualified to favour the germination of imperialistic ideas. The Tory element was recruited from the ranks of the Established Church and the landed aristocracy—both conservative in the narrowest sense of the word, both opposed to internal reforms and to adventures abroad, though instinctively favorable to the autocratic and military government of the Empire. The Liberal faction which followed Mr. Chamberlain had sprung from the radical element; until then, its members had championed the most advanced reforms: the extension of franchise and of public education, the improvement of the labouring classes, state-control over public services. Fire and water are no more antagonistic to each other than this socialistic policy was to militarism and warlike expeditions; it logically excluded Imperialism and the interference of the British Parliament in Colonial affairs. But circumstances were soon to show how weak an obstacle principles and consistency oppose to the personal ambition of a man with an iron will, possessing the lust of power.

Mr. Chamberlain's Position.

The position of Mr. Chamberlain within the ranks of his allies was a thoroughly false one. He would fain have transferred from that Birmingham fortress of his the whole socialistic equipment through which he had come to be the prophet and the hope of the labour associations. The dogged opposition of his Tory colleagues was the rock on which his efforts foundered. He then made up his

mind that he should seek in foreign questions a favourable field for his activity. Anxious as he was to make the English people forget the failure of his social reform schemes, he endeavoured to stir up national pride. With methods akin to those of the demagogues of American politics, he soon succeeded in importing into England the tone and arguments of the yellow press. Taking advantage of what his disciples styled the senile timidity exhibited by Lord Salisbury in the settlement of the Sino-Japanese war, and of the gigantic schemes of Mr. Cecil Rhodes, he dangled before the eyes of the Jingoists the prospect of a Cape-to-Cairo African Empire. At the time of the Fashoda incident, his wreckless utterances frightened, and rightly so, his colleagues and sound public opinion. The doors of the Foreign Office were closed in his face. Then it was that he desperately threw himself into the imperialist movement, so congenial to his aggressive and domineering spirit. That he had found the royal road to success he had rightly surmised.

Doctrinaire Imperialists and their Impotency.

There is one theoritical point in which I concur with doctrinaire Imperialists, and it is that the British Empire, like all human institutions, cannot remain at a stand-still. It must tread the path traced by the development of its hereditary tendencies. In the opinion of the Liberal school, the logical outcome of the growth of Empire is the natural and harmonious disjunction of its component parts. According to the new school, this disastrous disruption can and must be obviated at any price for the general advantage of the Empire, and in the best individual interests of the Mother country and her colonies.

On the other hand, Imperialists — or at least British Imperialists — are alive to the fact that to draw closer that union is no easy task. In spite of official platitudes and temporary outbursts of enthusiasm, reports of which are sent over from the colonies by a well inspired press, they know from experience, and their instinct warns them, that free men, accustomed to govern themselves without any interference from outside, and with half a century enjoyment of all the national prerogatives, will not easily surrender such privileges. From their own history they have learned this lesson, that never do the intrigues of ambitions men and factions finally succeed in inducing a whole nation to take a step backward. That we are not so pliable as our titled and official representatives prove to be, they know or at least apprehend.

It is still a deep-rooted tradition in England that decentralisation and Colonial self-government are the underlying principles of the British Empire. This is the deliberate opinion of the influential classes, while with the masses it is an instinctive sentiment. Towards the colonies the English people, at large, are still indifferent. That we have contributed soldiers and arms in defence of the Empire in his African war, the Englishman knows very well; but as these uncalled-for manifestations of devotedness have neither resulted in victories gratifying to his national pride, nor brought him any relief from the heavy burdens thrown upon him by this disastrous war, he does not think it worth while to respond to our love in the noisy, demonstrative manner which has become familiar to us,— still less to impose upon himself the slightest sacrifice in the shape of trade advantages to the colonies (1),— the more so, as our official representatives lose no opportunity of impressing upon him that we do not ask for any compensation. This coldness of the English people may eventually prove the best safeguard of our liberty against enterprising jingoists or weak-spirited politicians.

The group of the systematical Imperialists whose object would be to re-organise the Empire from a threefold standpoint—political, commercial and military,—represent but an insignificant faction in the British Parliament. After bringing to white-heat the fervour of these enthusiasts, Mr. Chamberlain, practical as he ever is, left them in the lurch. In Parliament, they made several attempts to further their views on the ground of commercial Imperialism. No later than last session, they seized the House of Commons with a motion in favour of inter-imperial preferential trade. On the very evening that Sir Howard Vincent moved his resolution, Mr. Chamberlain, whose health was flourishing the day before, as well as the day after, was unavoidably absent from the House on the plea of ill-health, leaving to his colleague, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, the task of strangling in the cradle the first-born of those theories of his (2).

But it is with Imperialism as with many other doctrines, and heresies especially, the diffusion of which is wrought rather by the action of indirect forces than by the voice of their best recognised exponents. In the economical and military situation of Great Britain, Mr. Chamberlain finds a field of action, interested co-operators, and arguments far more forcible than the homilies of those who

---

(1) See *Appendices*, chapters V and VI.

(2) See *Appendices*, pages LXXXVI. to XCI.

worship at the shrine of an Empire upon which the sun is never allowed to set (1).

Decay of British Industry.

But unquestionably it is with free trade as with any other political system which does not extend beyond the sphere of material interests: whether it be true or beneficial altogether depends upon its endorsation by the majority. In Cobden's own mind, not until, following in the footsteps of England, all the other nations should have thrown their gates wide open to the world, was his work to achieve perfection. Now, in this regard, the expectations of the great economist have been falsified.

The English producer has seen the civilised nations gradually closing their doors against him. His best customers, Germany and the United States, have boldly gone into extensive manufacturing. For some years the trade of Great Britain was not seriously hampered. Her vessels still went on carrying over the seas articles of consumption for the whole world. As a result, her Statistical Year-Book contained almost fabulous figures which evoked general astonishment. It must be remembered that these ever-increasing figures do not merely represent the selling and purchasing power of the British people. Of these an enormous proportion covers the cargoes of exchange which are simply entered and cleared, England being only left the profits — no doubt very large — accruing from the cost of transportation. By this, neither the English manufacturer nor the English workmen, nor the exporter of English-made goods, is in the least benefited. Thanks to her marine and to her widely-scattered Empire, England has, until within recent years, continued flooding with the output of her manufactures the markets of remote and half-civilised countries. But there came a time when, from the protective policy of the other industrial nations, flowed an unlooked-for result. After having realised enormous profits on their own markets, closed as they are to foreign competition, German and American manufacturers took to exporting their over-production to foreign markets, selling their goods with a bare margin of profit and even beneath the cost of production.

---

(1) Nearly at the very moment I was giving utterance to this remark, Mr. ASQUITH, the acknowledged leader of the Liberal Imperialists, made a similar statement in a speech delivered at Edinburgh on the 16th October, which I find thus reported in the Montreal *Herald* of the 21st of October :—

"The most formidable enemies of free trade are not to be found in people like my friend "Sir Howard Vincent and his ragged regiment of economic Bohemians.... There are large "sections of the Tory party who are honeycombed with fiscal heresies They tell us that "we are the only great free-trade country in the world, and ask whether we are wiser than "our neighbours or competitors..."

A further result is proving fatal to the English manufacturers, which is the outcome of that intellectual torpor, so characteristic of the race, and made still more glaring by their self-confidence, a quality that has stood them in such good stead on many an occasion. As a French diplomatist once remarked to me, this quality is turned into a defect, the moment it is deprived of its means of action. Apt as he is to believe that the whole world was created for the benefit of England, other nations having to be content with her leavings, the English manufacturer thinks that mankind is only too happy to wear the same style of dress, hats and shoes, as the citizens of London and Birmingham think fashionable. English products are being gradually superseded by similar German and American goods suitable to the taste of the countries where they are sold.

Owing to this blind self-confidence, coupled with his habits of order and thrift, the English manufacturer labours under a further disadvantage. While he works his machinery to the snapping point, his foreign competitors are unceasingly improving their process of manufacture and striving to bring their methods up to date. They manage to manufacture in a quicker and cheaper way, notwithstanding higher paid labour as in the United States, and the scarcity and cost of raw material, as is the case with Germany.

From these combined circumstances arises a practical result which is being felt all over the world; and to-day dry goods and cutlery "made in Germany", machinery, locomotives and steel rails manufactured under the prohibitive duties of the Dingley tariff, are to be bought everywhere. And by "everywhere" I mean not only such neutral countries as where England and her competitors are battling with equal arms, but in Cobden's own land, at the very doors of her great manufacturing centres, Manchester, Sheffield and Glasgow (1).

Role of the English Colonies.

What part have the English colonies played in this contest where the Mother country is daily loosing ground and strength? So far, they have done their duty by themselves, as it behooved the daughters of a mother who rightly prides in her commercial genius. Their still growing populations, scattered over vast territories, the needs of their infant industries, the instinctive aversion of young and rather poor communities to direct taxation, all these causes

(1) See *Appendices*, ch. IX : *Depression of British Industry* (page CXXVIII).

have conspired to the adoption, by the colonies, of high tariffs of a more or less protective nature.

In Canada, owing to the neighbourhood of the United-States, apart from any other motive, we have been precluded from carrying out Cobden's theories. In spite of our recent attempts to open our doors wider to British trade, it may be assumed in a general way that for many years to come, the colonies will maintain their customs tariffs on all their imports, including those from England.

Commercial Imperialism.

Hence the British manufacturer stands confronted by the following conditions: his goods are shut out from the markets of the civilised world by protection, and from the open markets by foreign competition, whereas the needs of home consumption are amply supplied. He looks about, in quest of a remedy. He begins to question whether he had not sooner build up for himself a more modest abode than the world-palace in which he has so far dwelt as a supreme ruler. In order to secure a few markets which he might properly call his own, he would gladly consent to a few sacrifices of principle and even of treasure, to be shared in common with his fellow-citizens. To achieve that result he needs turn to countries where he could exercise some political authority. Only in the English colonies is such a situation to be found.

But "*give and take*" is the cardinal principle of good business relations, and of this the British manufacturer is well aware. He is the last man to believe that sentimental outbursts may be producive of permanent results. He foresees that when once they have outlived the period of fierce love, the Colonies will demand in return for their self-sacrifices more substantial rewards than medals and titles for their great men. Then it is that the problem bristles with difficulties.

Impoverished as he is, and overburdened by direct taxation, the British rate-payer does not mean to tax his own food, that English plutocrats may acquire the estates of a ruined aristocracy, nor even to bestow favours upon his colonial kinsfolk, whose welfare is of far less moment to him than the problem of his every day meal. For it is the necessaries of life that the Colonies have to sell him, and on which he may offer them a profit. On silk goods and wines from France, on toys and fancy articles from Germany, on art products from Italy, he would readily have duties levied; but neither would the English manufacturer nor the farmer from the Colonies benefit thereby. From every colony would come a demand to the British ratepayer to impose a duty: from Canada, on his lumber, bread-

stuffs, butter and eggs; from Australia and South Africa, on his wool and woollen goods, and his meat; from the West Indies, on his sugar, already taxed for the purpose of replenishing an empty public exchequer, a result of Messrs Rhodes' and Chamberlain's entreprises; to say nothing of the fact that he has long been paying double price for his tea and his ale, in order to maintain his army, navy and monarchy (1).

And thus it happens that for the purpose of extending a slight favour to the producers of each colony individually, the English consumer would be compelled to burden with taxes almost every staple article of consumption. How absurd the Zollverein is, which is so dear to the heart of Sir Charles Tupper and of Sir Howard Vincent, is thereby clearly shown.

Distress of England.

MILITARY IMPERIALISM.

From the question of taxation I am led to the study of British Imperialism as viewed from the standpoint of England's military position. Disastrous as it is to-day, that situation was already but too complicated before the peasant-soldiers of the Transvaal and the Free State had started striking at the British Lion such terrible blows as they have dealt out within the last two years.

Let England show herself in the least aggressive or exacting, and forthwith causes of conflict will crop up in every direction. In Egypt, in Afghanistan, in the Southern Seas, from the insolence of a clerk, from the blunder of a Consular agent, from the exigencies of any one of her Colonies, she may be forced into a war with France, Russia or Germany. Owing to the eclipse of her ascendency in China, she is already being made to pay by anticipation, and a hundred fold, for all that the gold mines on the Rand and the diamonds of Kimberley could ever yield. England has learnt lessons from her South African misadventure, which she will remember; and, from a strictly military point of view, one of these object-lessons is that, brave as they are, British officers are inefficient, and that such recruits as she may now enlist do not deserve the name of soldiers, being, on the confession of Lord Kitchener himself, but a mere horde of cumbersome parasites.

Great Britain has always placed more reliance on her navy than on her army for the general defence of the Empire. I am quite

---

(1) See Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's speech, in the House of Commons, page LXXXIX of the *Appendices*.

willing to coincide with the general opinion in vogue till lately—an opinion which, by the way, is less general nowadays — and say that the supremacy of the British navy remains unimpaired. But is the British navy still able to cope with the combined fleets of any two other nations? For such is the principle laid down by the British authorities as the primary guarantee of the safety of the Empire; and such is the question, which being asked by many a well-informed Englishman, they all hesitate answering in the affirmative (1). That this same problem is being solved abroad in a much more pessimistic spirit as to Great Britain goes without saying. I am not at all qualified to revise these calculations; but what may be asserted without rashness and without technical knowledge, is this, that it has grown out of fashion for the world at large to stand in awe of British power. Hence risks of Great Britain being involved in war have largely increased.

Moreover, the provoking policy which, in spite of the resistance offered by Lord Salisbury, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and other disciples of the old conservative school, the jingo element have forced upon the British Government, renders very problematical the certainty and even the possibility of any foreign alliance. Long shall England have to remain in her present isolation which to her does not seem so splendid now as it did heretofore. But, even though there were no cause of alarm other than the present war — which is by no means within the realm of imagination — Great Britain is in sore need of recruits to fill the ranks of her army (2). Did she persist in discarding the ideas championed by Cobden, Bright and all those whom Mr. Chamberlain, in one of his frolicsome moods, nicknamed "little Englanders", — did she refuse to reverse her policy of militarism, — where is she going to find the necessary material to meet her deficiencies? Two resources only she has at her disposal: conscription, or an appeal to the Colonies, a resort to either of which would prove equally dangerous.

Conscription or Appeal of the Colonies.

Conscription spells danger from within; conscription conjures up revolt from five millions of angry British toilers, a fresh curse to be grafted on Irish hatred; possibly, conscription means the disruption of the United Kingdom, the overthrow of Monarchy and the advent of social revolution.

---

(1) See *Appendices*, ch. IV (2° NAVY), page LXXI.

(2) See, in the *Appendices*, Mr. Brodrick's speech in the House of Commons, 8th March 1901 (page LXV) and Lord Wolseley's, in the House of Lords, 28th June (page LXX).

Neither is an appeal to the Colonies attended with less formidable difficulties. Forced contributions of men and money are out of the question. But the Imperialists are clinging on to the hope bred in them by the naivety, the enthusiasm, the gullibility, so many proofs of which have been given by the colonists, within the last two years.

Imperialists entertain the ultimate hope — and of all their theories this is perhaps the most plausible and the most dangerous to us — that at the critical moment the problem is to be solved by an amalgamation of military and economical imperialism. The British rate-payers would be induced to consent to increased taxation in favour of colonial products, by being led into the belief that the only alternative to the bugbear of conscription lies in this assistance of colonial legions. The Colonies, on the other hand, would be invited to fill the ranks of the army and navy by being offered trade advantages. To sum up the theory, the colonies are to purchase, by paying the tax of blood, the advantage of a preferential treatment in the british market for their farm produce. Whether the contract be carried out or not, we may even now consider as a foregone conclusion that the balance of profit will not be in our favour.

It seems almost superfluous to add that so long as the Colonists are simple enough to offer their blood without any compensation, the Mother country will place no obstacle in their way. (1)

Jingoism, Sports, Materialism.

The third basis on which British Imperialism rests is that blatant Jingoism referred to a moment ago.

On this point, Cobden's anticipations have been realised. Colonial expansion, even where peacefully carried out and without any regard to Imperialism, has promoted the growth of militarism in British institutions. Into the ranks of shopkeepers who have invented the axiom: "*Trade follows the flag,*" the lust of territorial acquisition has wormed its way. In British youths, brutal instincts are being developed by the invasion of sportic games. There is, now-a-days, in the higher ranks of English society a large class of young men who have become masters in such arts as managing a stud, organising a stable, supervising a dog-kennel. Thirsting as they are for glorious adventures, these hardy young men are very ill-prepared to shine in the councils of the nation. From the ascen-

---

(1) This tallies with the opinion very distinctly expressed by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach in his speech, at Liverpool, 24th October, 1900. See *Appendices*, page XLVIII *et seq.*

dency which this class of athletes are daily gaining, the debasement of the moral and intellectual standard of the British Parliament, and the growing power of fiery appeals to a spirit of pride and aggressiveness, are easily accounted for.

Last year, Mr. Brunetière wrote a remarkable article dealing with the moral situation of England, her virtues and vices, her glories and her weak points (1). To his mind, the great social crime of the English people lies in this, that by disseminating throughout the world the greed of gold and a love for luxurious living, they have debased the ideals of mankind.

If that theory be true, this greed of gold was bound to find its nemesis in Africa. For our own safety, and for the welfare of the world, which is still in need of the lessons so great and so fruitful to be learnt from the best English traditions, let us hope that the whole weight of punishment will fall upon the guilty ones.

The Colonies Taxed as in 1774.

Though with different outward signs, and with dissimilar means of action, the Imperialist movement is shaped on lines and is aiming at results similar to those which lured the autocratic government of George III into their struggle with the American colonies in the 18th century: TAXATION OF THE COLONIES FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE EMPIRE. To this fact, last year, Lord Selborne, Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, with that characteristic frankness of British statesmen — a feature both interesting and fruitful of English politics — publicly bore witness. In his opinion, the only difference lies in this, that the ministers of George III blundered into a policy of colonial taxation by the British parliament, whereas the present ministers are endeavouring to induce the colonists to use their power of self-taxation for the benefit of the Mother-country (2). The present schemes of British rulers are attended both with greater facilities and more serious obstacles than was the situation of 1774. They are in closer touch with the Colonies; in the remote possessions of England, numerous and devoted cooperators of the home government are to be found in a class of conceited speculators and politicians, greedy of titles and honours. On the other hand, owing to

---

(1) I have not under my hand the English review in which that article was published in French. If my memory serves me well, it was in the *Quarterly Review*, of either January or April, 1901. On this point, I am free to say that I prefer Mr. Brunetière's opinion to the far more severe views expressed by Lord Beresford. See *Appendices*, page CXXVIII.

(2) See *Appendices*, page CVII.

the enjoyment of half a century of greater freedom and to the steady progress of democracy, both in England and in the Colonies, the Imperialist plans are more difficult of achievement.

Mr. Chamberlain's Means of Action.

Let us examine for a moment the methods by which Mr. Chamberlain is striving to bring the Colonies over to his views.

He began by dangling before their eyes the bait of an Imperial Zollverein. But, as I said before, he had to back out of his position in face of the hostile attitude of the English rate-payers. In spite of his dogged tenacity, the Colonial Secretary does not long cling to ideas which have no chance of success. This pet scheme of his, however, he did not give up before he had wrested from the colonial governments the promise of a contribution to the British army and navy. That the whole system rests on the idea of colonial military contributions, it cannot be questioned; all the rest—commercial reciprocity, political representation, judiciary appeal — are mere accessories tending to secure the adoption of the principle and its permanent development. Soldiers and seamen, is what England needs, and to extort such help from the Colonists, she resorts to every available force of attraction.

With that audacity of his, which is at times akin to genius, Mr. Chamberlain bluntly put the question to the Premiers of all the self-governing Colonies, gathered in London for the great Jubilee of 1897. The moment was well chosen. In a piece of oratory that will remain classical, and recalls one of Macaulay's most beautiful pages, where the great historian describes the solemn preparations of Hasting's trial before the House of Lords, Sir Wilfrid Laurier has described this ostentatious display of Imperial pageant, chiefly meant to dazzle the Colonial subjects of Her Majesty (1).

Imperialist Comedy.

JUBILEE, ROAYL TRIP, THE KING'S CORONATION.

Mr. Chamberlain may be credited with a clear insight into human nature; he knows that a love for parade is among the common failings of popular masses, and that nothing will secure a warmer welcome to a poor play than clap-trap and a showy stage-setting.

---

(1) See, in the *Appendices*, the speech of the Duke of Devonshire, pages VIII—IX.

The Jubilee was the opening scene of the Imperialistic comedy. The trip *à la Jules Verne* of Their Royal Highnesses has filled the intermission. The coronation of His Majesty will be the closing scene of the play.

But " grasp all, lose all " is an aphorism which applies here. In spite of the hosannas of a time-serving press, the royal trip has belied the expectations of its promoters. As at the time of the Jubilee, so upon the occasion of the Coronation, official representatives from the colonies will gather in London, who may easily be won over and fashioned into docile tools of the powers that be: a title to one, a medal to another, an opening in the House of Lords, kissing His Majesty's hand: few virtues are proof against such temptations.

But when royal favours are peddled from door to door, like apples and doughnuts, they lose much of their lustre and prestige. It is no longer a question of entrapping a few select political personages open to conviction, and in whose capture British statesmen must find as much delight as professional sportsmen do when hunting priceless game. The ambition and vain glory of a gaping crowd must be pampered. The unfortunate princes are apt to blunder in a thousand ways: here, a reception is cancelled, and thousands of good people are denied the pleasure of prostrating themselves before the idol, who for months had been ransacking the fashionable clothing stores and torturing soul and body to come up to the degree of grotesque required by Court etiquette; there, some important personage is offered but a paltry tip, who expected to get at least a knighthood, satisfied as he is that he had stooped low enough before Jingoism to deserve such a recognition; elsewhere, another big-wig who had put on a thousand dollars worth of furs, bought expressly for the occasion, does not receive a solitary picayune. You think I am joking, but I am quite in earnest. Were the secret and moving causes of most political evolutions to transpire, you would be amazed at the decisive part played therein by the most childish vanities and the most vulgar ambitions.

Results of the Jubilee.

It must be admitted on the other hand that, in 1897, Mr. Chamberlain did not achieve any immediate result. Sir Gordon Sprigg, the Premier of Cape Colony, was the only one who promised a contribution that was readily ratified by the Parliament of his Colony (1).

---

1) See *Appendices*, page XXIV *et seq.*

By a cruel irony of facts, Cape Colony is now chafing under the yoke of military despotism; its constitution has been suspended, and the volonteers enlisted, equipped and paid by those very same Colonies which had refused their contribution in 1897, are now helping to ransack the farms and to hang the inhabitants of the only Colony which yielded a ready consent to the request of the Imperial government. But let me not anticipate events.

The Colonial secretary was the last man to be disheartened by the refusal of the colonial delegates. Meanwhile, he succeeded in prevailing upon several of them to commit themselves by word of mouth. Then it was that Mr. Laurier, — who by the way had now become Sir Wilfrid, and a member of the Privy Council of Great Britain — publicity pledged the aid of the Colonies in defence of the Mother country. To my mind it never occurred to the Prime Minister of Canada that in so doing he was going beyond a hearty acknowledgement of England's generous hospitality(1),—which was evidenced from his attempted opposition to the sending out of Canadian troops to South Africa. But our representatives, when addressing the British public, should bear in mind that Englishmen are by no means so fond of high-sounding formulas as we are. Used as they are to hear their statesmen think aloud and speak their own minds, they look more to the substance than to the form of political declarations, and take words for what they mean.

Mr. Chamberlain made the most of his opportunities by following up quickly the gains secured from the Colonial Prime Ministers, and he started sowing throughout the Empire the seeds of Imperialism which were to germinate so luxuriantly.

Jingoism in the Colonies.

SOUTH-AFRICAN WAR.

I have referred to the development of Jingoism in England. This beautiful flower Mr. Chamberlain hastened to transplant into the Colonies where it could not fail to find a favourable soil for its growth and efflorescence. It was from their fitness to grow this mustard-seed that the Governors-General and the Commanders of colonial militias dispatched from England since the Jubilee, were

(1) I have left this statement of my own views exactly as it was first uttered. But I must say that from the research and compilation of the numerous documents which are to be found in the *Appendices*, I have been led to see in their proper light many facts of which theretofore I had but a faint notion. I refer the reader to the record of the Jubilee, ch. I of the *Appendices*.

all selected. Of this class Lord Minto and Col. Hutton are supreme types. A man with no political record and with no future prospect in public life, trained as he was to soldierly rule, the "*fils de famille*" who presides over our destinies, was sent here to stir up the Imperialistic movement, in disregard of the traditions of dignity and respect to the Constitution inaugurated by Lord Elgin, and scrupulously adhered to by all his successors for the last fifty years. As to Gen. Hutton, he made a boast of having smashed a Cabinet in Australia, and in the midst of his petty court of Rideau Club, in Ottawa, he declared that he was ready to repeat the same exploit in Canada.

The Transvaal question was then entering upon its acute period. As I have stated on the floor of the House of Commons, it was in order to snatch from the Colonies, at a moment when the voice of reason is stifled by pride and passions, the tribute of blood which until then he had been denied, that Mr. Chamberlain forced the South African war.

However, the movement was admirably organised and does credit to the enterprising genius of the dictator of our destinies. Under the name of the South African League, Mr. Cecil Rhodes started a huge trust composed of all the speculators of the Rand. By means of this powerful body, he bought out nearly every English newspaper in the Transvaal, in the Free State, in Cape Colony, in Natal, and he had a regular system of correspondence organised between the editors of that reptile press and the Tory and Jingoist newspapers of London, foremost of which was the *Daily Mail*. Then, in their turn, these well-informed organs would send over the good word to the newspapers having the widest circulation in the various Colonies. Here, the paper which was deemed worthy of being the standard-bearer of the Transvaal stock-jobbers, was the *Montreal Star*.

Then it was that, throughout the British world, was started and kept up that campaign of falsehoods in the course of which the ferocious inhabitants of the Transvaal and their interesting victims, Cecil Rhodes & Co., were described under such colours as were best calculated to inflame the indignation of British subjects throughout the world. People have at times wondered at the warlike spirit which was then displayed by our English-speaking fellow-citizens. What to me seems still more strange is this, that after having been saturated during three months with so corrosive a liquid, their blood was not still more overheated.

With this preliminary work Mr. Rhodes did not rest satisfied. Towards the end of the session of 1899, a certain Mr. Allen, an official of the "Chartered Company", arrived in Ottawa. He organised among members of Parliament a Committee of his

League, wherein he introduced a few heads from each herd — I beg your pardon! — a few representatives of every political group: Grits, Tories, *Rouges, Bleus,* Senators, members of the House of Commons, past, present and future Ministers of the Crown (1). He then made a glowing description of the sufferings and humiliations to which the Uitlanders of Johannisberg were subjected. It was this very same individual who hastily snatched from Parliament, one Monday morning, a resolution of sympathy with the miners and approval of Mr. Chamberlain's policy. Of course, this resolution was moved by the Prime Minister and seconded by the leader of the Opposition. (2)

Intrigues of Lord Minto and General Hutton.

Meanwhile, the Governor-General and the Commander of the Militia did not remain with their arms folded. In July, 1899, while Mr. Chamberlain was tendering to Mr. Kruger an offer of arbitration which he withdrew later on, General Hutton was writing to several officers of the Canadian Militia, urging them to get ready to take active service in South Africa. That the frantic campaign conducted by the *Star* in September was inspired by Lord Minto and managed by General Hutton, I affirm without hesitation. In well informed circles, Mr. Graham's trips to Ottawa were an open secret. While the Prime Minister was stating that the Cabinet would not send out troops, General Hutton asserted that the Cabinet would send out troops. It was the General who carried the day.

Do you understand now why the government wheeled around all of a sudden, and yielded to a demand for the enlistment of troops after meeting it with a refusal? Do you understand why, at the general election of 1900, both government and Opposition candidates vied with each other in distorting the meaning of that event? Do you understand why party-organs and camp-followers wish to draw the curtain over this episode, and consign to oblivion and contempt the few voices that were raised in protest against these intrigues and wire-pullings in high and low places?

No Precedent.

An attempt has been made at disarming our suspicions and allaying our misgivings by promising us that this action of the

---

(1) See *Appendices*, page CXXXIV.

(2) See *Appendices*, page XXXI *et seq.*

government should not be construed into a precedent. But to the Order in Council embodying this rider, the Colonial Secretary replied by sending his thanks to Canada for having assumed her share of the burdens of Empire; and our representatives did bow acquiescence, and our Parliament, with the exception of ten votes, refused to ratify the reservation made by the Cabinet. (1)

On the strength of this tacit acquiescence, Mr. Chamberlain boasted on the floor of the House of Commons and on all the platforms in England and Scotland, that he had at last secured the participation of the Colonies in the wars of the Empire and that the losses of the war were more than compensated by this happy result. (2)

In this scheme so marvelously contrived and carried out there was but one flaw: the Boers did not play the part assigned to them by Mr. Chamberlain. Both Dewet and Botha still persist in denying the United-Empire the baptism of glory dreamed of by its creator.

Never daunted by obstacles which only nerve him to renewed exertion, the Colonial Secretary goes on with his work in spite of reverses and disasters; but those reverses are but a forerunner of the angry shrieks which will soon haunt him, should the god of battles, at whose shrine he would fain have the Empire worship, be unwilling to lend a more favourable ear to his prayers.

Colonial Representation.

That Imperialism rests on militarism I stated above; but I will now approach some consequences of this military policy.

I say that from the fact of our contributing, whether directly or indirectly, whether permanently or accidentally, to the imperial exchequer, it necessarily follows that we should be represented in the Imperial Councils.

That among colonials of modern times, and mainly among the Australians, the sense of pride and the standard of intelligence are by no means so much below the standard of the same characteristics displayed by the American colonists of 1776 as would at first sight appear, the British authorities know very well. They are also alive to the fact that we shall not always be fooled into believing

---

(1) See *Appendices*, page xxxv *et seq.*

(2) "I say that the losses of the war — the losses of treasure certainly, and I think I would almost say the loss of life — will be compensated by the new sense of unity in this great Empire. We have realised the Empire!" Speech at Oldham, 25th September, 1900 (Extra-Parliamentary *Hansard*, Vol II.)

that when making an outlay of $2,500,000 for sending out troops to South-Africa, we are not contributing to the imperial exchequer, nor to a war the conduct of which, both political and military, is utterly beyond our control.

How to provide such adequate representation as would prove satisfactory to the motherland and to the colonies alike is the question we are met with. Were such a system to find acceptance with colonials, they should at least be persuaded — to put it mildly — into the belief that they are given their due share of control over the appropriation of such moneys as they would be called upon to contribute to the imperial exchequer. On the other hand, neither should colonial representation obstruct the mechanism already too complicated of the Home government, in the management of domestic business, nor should it take away from the British government their supreme control over imperial affairs.

Many schemes have been propounded, all of which have failed to come up to actual needs.

As to representation in the Imperial Parliament, that is altogether out of question. The presence of the Irish members in the House of Commons is already proving troublesome enough to the English, but that their numbers should be swelled by the admission to Parliament of Canadians, Australians, New-Zealanders and Africans. As to the House of Lords, so abhorrent is it to the feelings of the noble Peers to see their sanctuary invaded, that in such aversion we have a guarantee that our virtuous Canadian democrats and Australian socialists will not be tempted — collectively, at least — into surrendering their principles.

It is suggested that a sort of Consultative Council should be created to which a limited number of delegates from every colony would be admitted. Under such a plan, it would be the business of those delegates, acting as outside members of the colonial cabinets, to transmit their decisions to their respective governments to be submitted for ratification to the parliaments in the colonies. The dangers which such a scheme might conjure up I need not dwell upon. From our experience of the influence now exerted from afar by the British authorities over colonial ministers, it may safely be inferred that for the British government to keep under the yoke men in close touch with them, and upon whom the whole weight of their favours and seductions could be brought to bear, would prove no difficult task. In all such issues as involved the interests of both the Mother country and the colonies, the British government would never fail to secure a majority in the council, which would prove the easier from the fact that the United Kingdom would long be represented by a larger number of delegates that the combined colonial representation.

That colonial parliaments would be free to withhold their sanction is no doubt true. But such decisions being crystalised into government measures, a notable change would have to come over Canada and our political ethics, for such a guarantee to prove effective.

Besides, do not let it be supposed that such a council is going to be suddenly called into being by an Act of the Imperial Parliament. Nothing could be more foreign to British traditions. You may depend upon it, in the old country, they are good hands at shaping constitutional evolutions.

They will, as an initial step, invite the opinion of the colonial Prime Ministers who are going next summer to the King's coronation to lay at the feet of His Majesty a tribute of the unswerving loyalty of his colonial subjects and a pledge of their robust naïveté as well. This is going to be but a second edition of the Jubilee.

Then, later on, if need be, another opportunity may be seized for again calling to the Metropolis representatives from the colonies. Those visits *ad limina*, so to speak, will in the end recur periodically, and our colonial agents, being meanwhile on the spot, will feel but too happy to act the part of those duennas in comic plays who carry the "*billets doux*" exchanged between lovers. Finally, accomplished facts will be given a legal sanction.

These are the methods which have gone to the making of all British institutions (1).

Colonial Agents.

Already Mr. Chamberlain has succeeded in remodeling the rôle of colonial agents in London and converting their offices into so many branches of the Colonial Office. Downing-street is near Victoria street, but the office of the Colonial Secretary is still nearer Lord Strathcona's office.

That the noble Lord has given his endorsation to the creation of an Imperial Council, a scheme which has also been approved of by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and by the Hon. Mr. Ross, the Ontario Premier, you may perhaps be unaware (2). No wonder, indeed, that Lord Strathcona should be so surcharged with devotion to imperial interests. In the eyes of the former president of the Canadian

---

(1) In this connection, see, in the *Appendices*, Mr Chamberlain's speech at the Jubilee Conference, page IV; the Colonial Premiers' addresses during the Jubilee festivities, pages VIII *et seq.*; the debate on Colonial Representation, page CIII; the reports of the Congresses of the Chambers of Commerce, pages CV *et seq.*

(2) See *Appendices*, pages XVIII et CXIX. Mr. Ross seems to have modified his opinions on this matter: he prefers the pilgrimage system (page CXXII).

Pacific Railway Company, the government that opened to him the doors of the House of Lords is undoubtedly the most desirable and the best government in the world. But what I am still more surprised at is that the political destinies of Canada should be largely left in Lord Strathcona's hands. It ought to be provided in our statute-book that the Canadian High-Commissioner in London shall not accept any favour at the hands of the British government.

Titles and Decorations.

Some may perhaps think that I have dwelt at too great a length upon these matters of titles and decorations. But to my mind, they are of greater importance than is generally believed. For many centuries, it was but a means for the Crown to pander to a craving among its subjects which is absolutely harmless, and one inherent, so to speak, in human nature, being found among the Red-skins and encouraged also by the Congo potentates among their faithful servants. With the latter it is customary to wear medals in the ears or in the nose, while with us it is the fashion to pin them upon the breast or the abdomen, in all which cases the principle is the same.

Now, under imperialistic rule, such trifles assume a novel signification. Mr. Chamberlain expects that the men who are to receive those rewards should deserve them, and when his servants happen to fail in their duty, he takes precious good care to refresh their memory. I, for one, should not offer the least objection to political gratitude growing into a habit with us, were not such services to be paid for at the cost of the people's liberties (1).

Our Guarantees.

So far, I have reviewed rather at random Imperialism with its aims, its hopes, and its means of action, pointing out at the same

---

(1) Possibly I may have too exclusively circumscribed to our own times the feature of political corruption of which royal decorations bear the stamp. Being one day asked why he had refused the Garter, Lord Melbourne made reply "that he did not see why he should be such a fool as to buy himself, when he could buy somebody else with it." (See "*Walpole*" of John Morley, page 74). This system Mr. Chamberlain has extended to the colonies, and it is from the colonial standpoint that the change I have pointed out has chiefly made itself felt. These remarks, let it be well understood, apply neither to magistrates nor to state-officials, nor to professors, that is, to any of those who neither are actually in the political arena nor intend to enter the same. My ideal is Governor Jones, of Nova-Scotia, declining twice the offer of a title. But there is no disputing about tastes. Far be it from me to say or to insinuate a word of disparagement against such men as think it fit to accept similar rewards, and who, from the position they occupy, are not bound to show, at the sacrifice of our national independence, their gratitude to Mr. Chamberlain.

time the dangers it conjures up, as also the obstacles which circumstances place in the way of its progress.

Our guarantees, I must confess, are greater abroad than at home.

In England, apart from the indifference of the people to our interests, we may rely upon the resistance offered to Imperialism by the middle classes, and mainly by the educated classes. Nowadays the braggarts have it all their own way; but the day is not far distant when those upright and well-thinking men who have braved the storm of jingoism shall see their clear-sightedness and their courage duly appreciated.

The reaction, however, may be slow to come. The liberal party, so deeply divided as it is on the South African question, is afraid to approach the problem of Imperialism, and to look the question squarely in the face. For the most part, the opposition members are hostile to Mr. Chamberlain's Ceasarism and to his attempts at a barbarian conquest of South-Africa. But, lest the split in their ranks should be intensified, they seal their eyes to the connexion between the South-African question and the general policy of the Empire, and refrain from speaking their mind. In the eyes of the colonists, whom he fawns upon and whose good faith he skilfully exploits, Mr. Chamberlain is fast evolving into the supreme and infallible arbiter; and owing to the absence from the House of Commons of a parliamentary group of men willing and ready vigourously to denounce the weak and fallacious basis of his imperial policy, that policy is gradually gaining ground.

Australia and New-Zealand.

The Australians will prove more strenuous opponents of Imperialism than we are. To Mr. Chamberlain's attempts at amending, against their will, their constitutional charter, well they knew how to resist. While we, under the pressure of the Colonial Office, were blotting out of the statute book of British Columbia the anti-Mongolian Immigration Act, Australia was passing into law a similar and still more drastic measure, and to the demand of the British authorities for the repeal of that legislation they opposed a flat denial.

I think I have somewhat contributed to dispelling the legend about the enthusiam displayed by the Australian colonies upon the occasion of sending out their troops to South-Africa. Last summer, in London, I met a statesman who has occupied an important position in New-Zealand, and I have it from his own mouth that the loyalism of that colony is far less pronounced than, from her

outside attitude, one would be led to believe. By way of explanation, he told me that consequent upon her financial troubles, New-Zealand had made a warm appeal to British capital, the need of which was still being keenly felt. " But when, " he went on to say, " her financial standing shall have grown stronger there will be a considerable cooling off in the loyalty of New-Zealand. " To me, I confess this practical feature of imperialistic love was most gratifying.

In Canada.

In Canada, the situation seems to be fraught with greater dangers. With those who affect to call me a visionary I would fain believe that none here takes stock in Imperialism.

But when, looking backwards, I survey the route that has been travelled, I cannot help believing in the possibility of a fresh evolution or rather in the progress of the evolution already started.

At the outset of my still short parliamentary career, there was in the House of Commons a member from Ontario, Mr. MacNeill, who had been nicknamed the " Father of the Empire ". He was the only out-and-out Imperialist in the House, and everybody used to laugh at his prophesies and homelies. Now, three years later, the whole House was a unit in cheering to the echo the speeches fallen from the lips of the leaders of both parties, which, though more eloquent in tone than the addresses of that good old Mr. MacNeill, still emanated from the same source, were sandwiched with the same arguments, and had all the same object in view (1).

The " British Empire League ".

The Canadian branch of the British Empire League was, for many years, but a sort of a political club where a few enthusiasts like Dr. Parkin and Colonel Denison used to sing the glories of Imperialism. These gentlemen are still there, but by their side nowadays are to be found ministers of the Crown and a whole regiment of Senators and members of the House who are anxious to make up for lost time by repeating over and over again — only they do so with stronger enphasis now — the old speeches of the founders of the league. At the congress held last year, in Ottawa,

(1) See, in the *Appendices*, Mr. Russell's remarks, at the meeting of the " British Empire League ". page CXVII.

it was moved by a Conservative seconded by a Liberal that the time had come for the colonies to contribute to the maintenance of the Imperial army and navy (1). Last summer again, the Toronto *Globe* stated that the hour had struck for the colonies to pay the tribune of war to the motherland (2)

But in a public indifference, encouraged by political organs, lies the main danger; it lies also in a too strict party discipline, and finally in the want of an influential class of men who, while taking an interest in politics, keep aloof from the movements and intrigues of factions.

Our rural and urban popular classes are notably superior to the corresponding classes in England, — being more enlightened, more moral, more regardful of their own dignity, more conscious of their responsibilities. But I ask, where could they get the necessary information on all those topics? Surely not in the party organs, which, while they vie with each other, in the Quebec province, in denouncing the imperialistic tendencies of their opponents, take mighty good care to draw a red herring across the track, as to the tendencies of their own patrons. In the English-speaking provinces, it is a regular steeple-chase in which each party strives to out-run the other in the race of devotion to the Empire.

There are to be found in England a large class of highly educated men who closely watch the current of public affairs, making their views known in newspapers and magazines, before the various clubs and in social circles. These men, free as they are from all party ties, do indeed exert a considerable influence upon public opinion. The want of such a class of men is precisely what is felt here. Still, a feeling of independence is being awakened, which, let us hope, will be fraught with good results.

In a party spirit carried to a point of intensity unknown in England, and in the racial cleavage which is so rampant here, is to be found a two-fold element of weakness which leaves us poorly equipped indeed for warring against imperialistic schemes.

That in a country where the representative system obtains, the government is to be carried on by the see-saw policy of two parties, one in power and the other in opposition, I for one, readily admit. Further, that the action of politicians should, in a large measure, be shaped by their desire either of climbing into office or getting a new lease of power, I equally understand. But that, for the sake of remaining in office, or of turning a government out of power, men should sacrifice the very principles which are the guarantee of our security and of our national destinies, is indeed past my under-

---

(1) See *Appendices*, page CXVII.

(2) See *Appendices*, page CIII.

standing. What I still less understand is this, that an important section of those to whom the people has intrusted the protection of its interests should, from a sense of devotion to their leaders or to their party, vote in favour of what they inwardly condemn as a crime.

Our two Races.

From the presence of the two races in Canada, there is no reason, I believe, to dread any danger or even any additional troubles, if only our politicians be willing, instead of pandering to sectional prejudices, to appeal to the best sentiments of both elements.

A mutual regard for racial sympathies on both sides, and a proper discharge of our exclusive duty to this land of ours, such is the only ground upon which it is possible for us to meet, so as to work out our national problems. There are here neither masters nor valets; there are neither conquerors nor conquered ones: there are two partners whose partnership was entered into upon fair and well defined lines. We do not ask that our English-speaking fellow-countrymen should help us to draw closer to France; but, on the other hand, they have no right to take advantage of their overwhelming majority to infringe on the treaty of alliance, and induce us to assume, however freely and spontaneously, additional burdens in defence of Great Britain.

The Canadian soil, with its blood and its wealth, with its past, its present and its future, in short, our whole national inheritance is ours only to be handed down unimpaired to our descendants. I, for one, respect and admire in my English-speaking fellow-countryman his love for his dear old and glorious motherland;—and I am bound to say that he would be beneath my contempt the man who, in her hours of trial, did not tingle in sympathy with his Mother country. I have a right to expect that he should reciprocate that feeling by showing the same regard for his fellow-countrymen who still keep in their hearts an undying love for France, the land of their origin. But, apart from all such considerations within the province of the heart or of the mind, I say that the only sure way of obviating fatal misunderstandings lies in a determination that we shall, both of us, French and English alike, look at all constitutional and political questions from a purely Canadian standpoint.

Independence and Annexation.

From the nationality problem to the question of Independence is a natural transition. But the question of Independence, I frankly confess, is of no present moment.

As a primary condition of independence, a nation must need make sure that peace, both at home and abroad, is on a basis promising of continuance. So long as a more sincere and definite understanding between both races shall not have been reached — and not until the Canadian people have forced their public men to adopt a purely Canadian policy shall that happy result be achieved—I say that we are not ripe for Independence.

Even though, at home, we were ripe for Independence, I hold that, placed as we are in the immediate and exclusive neighbourhood of the United States, this ought to be a hint to us that it were safer to postpone the day of our emancipation.

The United States have reached a turning point in their history, which is proving just as formidable as the crisis through which England is now passing. For the time being, their thirst of expansion is being quenched in the blood of their " wards " in the Philippine Islands. But in the event of Canada becoming independent, it is in our direction that their frenzy would soon vent itself. To tell the truth, I am not of those who are lost in wonder and extasy at the material advantages to be derived from annexation to the United States.

Being younger and having more push, being also better endowed in the matter of natural resources and territorial unity, the Americans seem less obnoxious than their kinsmen across the sea to the consequences of the imperialist evolution. But they are wanting in such traditions and in great need of such a class as previously referred to of enlightened men who can still be largely instrumental in working out England's salvation. Being delivered over more and more to the wreckless schemes of a plutocracy which is alike unconscious of political responsibility and contemptuous of public morality, being more greedy than the English are of material gratifications, our neighbours are more exposed to those social crises a forerunner of which, and a warning as well, is to be found in the assassination of president McKinley.

At all events, should the risks of Annexation prove less to be dreaded than I am apprehensive of, it will never be too late for Canadians throwing in their political lot with the American Republic. A young nation has nothing to lose and everything to gain by having an alternative within its grasp. Under British rule, it is always optional with us to change our allegiance and to raise the star-spangled banner; while having become Americans, we should be absolutely, or at least for many years to come, bound to the Republic.

Of the many arguments that can be adduced to justify the necessity for us of unceasingly warring against the imperialist movement, even though we were sure that final victory will be ours.

one of the most cogent is based on the dangers reactions are attended with, which ever prove more violent than the previous movements.

The false position we are assuming cannot but be fraught with bitter disappointment, from the fallacious arguments resorted to by the promotors of that movement.

In Great Britain, what is mainly impressed upon the rate-payers is the profit to be derived from tapping the colonies and speculating upon their innocence, with a view to obtaining recruits for the army and the navy. In Canada, they make it a point to dwell upon the guarantees of peace and power, and trade development which are to be found in a closer connexion wth the Mother country. On the day when, as the English say, "we shall compare notes", wrangling will take the place of honeyed words. And what I apprehend is this, that such a counter-movement may hasten the progress of Annexation.

Under such circumstances, it is towards Independence that we should naturally drift; and beyond doubt, to the French-Canadian element, this solution would prove most acceptable. But such an independence as is gloriously proclaimed in the fulness of its strength and maturity by a united people is one thing, and such an emancipation as might be stimulated into a kind of hot-house growth by the intrigues of warring factions and by domestic quarrels is quite another matter. That the imperialistic disease has embittered relations between both races in Canada goes without saying. The majority of anti-imperialists being chiefly recruited from the ranks of French-Canadians, it stands to reason that were Independence to be proclaimed, it could only take place after protracted and acrimonious struggles which would re-echo long after the period of emancipation. Under the absolute control of the Canadian Parliament, our constitution would be exposed to terrible assaults, mainly directed against the French-Canadian minority, whose only refuge, under such circumstances, would be Pan-Americanism.

On the other hand, should such a reaction originate with the English-speaking provinces, it would proceed from mere considerations of profit and loss. It would be brought about by disappointed financiers, manufacturers and tradesmen, from not having derived from Imperialism all the benefit they anticipated. As a consequence, a disposition to draw closer to the United States would show itself, which would be largely encouraged by American capitalists who are already in a fair way of monopolising our trade avenues and several of our most important industries as well (1). With our

---

(1) See *Appendices: The Americans in Canada*, page CXXXII.

English-speaking fellow-countrymen there is no such aversion, bred by race, language and religion, as is felt by French-Canadians, to absorption by the American republic.

What I should like is this, that between the old British frigate which threatens to founder on the rock of Imperialism and the American corsair, making ready to pick up her wrecks, so cautiously and so steadily should we steer our bark that we shall neither be swallowed up in the abyss with the former, nor be carried away in the track of the latter. Let us not break the chain in a hurry, but let us also beware of foolishly riveting the links of it.

To such a situation as would be imposed on us by the triumph of imperialistic ideas these suggestions do not apply. Were the advocates of Imperialism ever to get the upper-hand, well, then, I should say: "Forward! Let us be independent, without any hesitation!" No people can afford to incur any unnecessary risks; but never should a nation hesitate to brave dangers and face the unknown, sooner than retracing its steps and falling back under the yoke.

Whatever the future may have in store for us, in the views of an all-wise Providence, whatever the drift of coming events, there is but one way of facing that future,—and it is this, that we shall neither be carried away by extravagant enthusiasm nor suffer our moral ideals to be debased. Let us deepen and broaden the lines of our patriotism, directing all its energies less towards the worship of party leaders than towards the pursuit of principles and lofty ideals. Let us make ready for the coming struggles, by fearlessly discharging, though in no spirit of vain glory, without flinching and like true-hearted men, the duties and the tasks of our every-day life.

APPENDICES

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INDEX OF NAMES.

ABBREVIATIONS.

P. D.: "Parliamentary Debates," of the British Parliament.

E. P. H.: "Extra-Parliamentary-Hansard," a selection of speeches made by public men outside of parliament, letters to the press, resolutions and manifestoes, etc. Published by G. WALPOLE, London.

NOTA. — All the italics in the quotations are mine. — H. B.

I

Diamond Jubilee.

1897.

1o. Official Documents.

On the 1st of February 1897, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN was asked, in the House of Commons, whether he was going to take advantage of the Jubilee festivities to hold a conference with a view to discussing matters of Imperial interest with the Colonial Premiers who would be present in London. The Colonial Secretary replied that the suggestion "*will be taken in consideration.*" (P. D., Vol. 45, page 924).

On the 23rd of the same month, Mr. Chamberlain was asked by two members if a decision had been arrived on the matter and what questions of Imperial concern would be discussed.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I will say in answer to both hon. gentlemen that there is no question of holding what is called an Imperial Conference, but, of course, if the Premiers come, the Government will take the opportunity of discussing with them any matters of common interest which *any of them may desire to raise*... (P. D., Vol. 46, page 978.)

On the 29th of March, the Colonial Secretary was asked if replies had been received from the Colonial Premiers, how many had accepted the invitation,

"and whether he can give a general indication of the subjects of Imperial interest on which it is proposed to invite their opinions and cooperation?"

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The answers from the Premiers of the self-governing Colonies are still incomplete. I have already stated that no formal conference is intended, although Her Majesty's Government will be glad to have the opinions and cooperation of the Premiers on any matters of common interest. (P. D., Vol. 47, page 1552.)

On the 13th of May, the Secretary of State for the Colonies laid down the correspondence exchanged with the Governors of the

self-governing Colonies on this matter (*Parliamentary Papers*, 1897, Vol. LIX, page 621 ;—No C : 8485). The papers show that three days before he declared in Parliament that the matter would be "*taken in consideration*", Mr. Chamberlain had taken official action. This is essentially characteristic of Mr. Chamberlain's methods. The whole imperialistic movement, both in Great Britain and the Colonies — but especially in the Colonies — has been marked, from the start, with this duplicity and secrecy of organisation.

In his official despatch to Lord Aberdeen, dated January 28th 1897 (No 2, page 624), Mr. CHAMBERLAIN was inviting the Prime Minister of Canada to be present at the celebration which was going to take place in London. He added :

6. Should it be found practicable to carry out this idea, as I hope may be the case, the great self-governing Colonies of Her Majesty's Empire would be appropriately represented by their Premiers, who would be accompanied on any special ceremonial occasion by an escort or *guard of honour* consisting of a detachment of the local forces ; and I have no doubt that such a demonstration would do honour to the colony and be highly appreciated in this country.

7. Her Majesty has also been pleased to signify her willingness to receive the Colonial Premiers, and to witness a march-past of the Colonial troops.

8. Should this invitation be accepted by the Premiers of the self-governing colonies, their presence in London would afford a most valuable opportunity for the discussion of many subjects of the greatest interest to the Empire, such as Commercial Union, Colonial Defence, Representation of the Colonies, Legislation with regard to emigrants from Asia and elsewhere, and other similar subjects.

9. It is not anticipated that the duration of the actual ceremonies in connection with the celebration will extend beyond a week ; but I am disposed to think that some four or five weeks might be profitably employed, not only in the discussion of the subjects I have mentioned, but in connection with other objects for the advancement of the interests of Her Majesty's Colonial Empire, and should Mr. Laurier find it in his power to remain so long in this country, Her Majesty's Government trust that he will allow them to consider him as their guest during this period.

A similar despatch was sent to the Governors of all the self-governing colonies. The Prime Minister of New South Wales, Mr. REID, hesitated in accepting (No 5, page 626). But the Premiers of all the other Australasian colonies having decided to accept the invitation, Mr. Reid gave way and went to London.

It will be noted, in some of the following documents, that Mr. REID was the only one, of all the Colonial representatives, to sound a somewhat discordant tune in the imperialistic concert of which Mr. Chamberlain constitued himself the director.

He was also the only one who refused a title and a decoration.

In none of the replies sent by the various colonial governments of Australasia, allusion or references were made to the proposed conference.

The Canadian Government was evidently better prepared to accept Mr. Chamberlain's direction. On the 20th of April 1897, Lord Aberdeen transmitted to the Colonial Secretary a Report of the Committee of the PRIVY COUNCIL of Canada, dated April 15th, acknowledging Mr. Chamberlain's invitation, and advising

"that the Premier and Madame Laurier should accept Her Majesty's gracious invitation to be present at the celebration, and that a suitable force selected from the Militia and other corps in the service of the Dominion of Canada should also be despatched to England in accordance with the suggestions contained in the despatch under consideration.

The Sub-Committee further join in the hope expressed by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State that it may be found possible to take advantage of the assemblage of the Premiers of the self-governing colonies for the discussion of the many and important questions of interest to the Empire to which he has referred.

The Sub-Committee unite most sincerely in the hope that the result of the approaching celebration may be such as will tend powerfully to cement the union between the Mother country and her colonies, *both socially and politically*... (No. 15, page 629.)

I need not say that this Report was never communicated to the Canadian Parliament. Nobody in Canada ever suspected that when the Prime Minister left for England to represent us at the Jubilee Celebrations, he was officially authorised and commissioned by his Cabinet to enter into a bargain with Mr. Chamberlain "to cement the union between the Mother country" and Canada "*both socially and politically.*" But this throws an instructive light upon the various speeches made in England by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and upon some of his declarations which caused so much amazement at the time.

On the 13th of August 1897, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN transmitted to the Governors of the self-governing colonies a Report of the "*Proceedings of a Conference between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Premiers of the self-governing colonies, at the Colonial Office, London, June and July* 1897." This Report had been presented to the British Parliament on the 31st of July (*Parliamentary Papers*, 1897; Vol. LIX, page 631; — No C. 8596).

In his letter to the Governors, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, referring to his despatch of the 28th of January already quoted:

...I intimated to you the hope of Her Majesty's Government that their — [the Colonial Premiers'] — presence here might afford a valuable opportunity for the informal discussion of many subjects of great interest to the Empire. I have now the honour to enclose for your information a memorandum showing how that hope was fully realised and giving an account of the business transacted...

Every Canadian anxious to know what the present rulers of England are aiming at in their colonial policy, should read attentively

that Report which has never been put before the public of this country. I will simply give the following summary and extracts.

The first meeting was held on the 24th of June. In his opening address, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN explained that what the British Government wished, was to ascertain the views of the colonial representatives on Imperial problems, saying:

"We are in the position of those who desire rather to learn your views than to press ours upon you."

He did not fail however to state his own views.

Regarding the political relations between the United Kingdom and the Colonies, he said:

...Strong as is the bond of sentiment, and impossible as it would be to establish any kind of relations unless that bond of sentiment existed, I believe we all feel that it would be desirable *to take advantage of it*, and to still further tighten the ties which bind us together. In this country, at all events, I may truly say that the idea of federation is in the air... It is quite true that our own constitution and your constitutions have all been the subject of very slow growth and that they are all the stronger because they have been gradually consolidated, and so perhaps with Imperial Federation: if it is ever to be accomplished it will be only after the lapse of a considerable time and by gradual steps...

I feel that there is a real necessity for some better machinery of consultation between the self-governing colonies and the Mother country, and it has sometimes struck me — I offer it now merely as a personal suggestion — that it might be feasible to create a great Council of the Empire to which the Colonies would send representative plenipotentiaries, — not mere delegates who were unable to speak in their name, *without further reference to their respective governments,* but persons who by their position in the colonies, by their representative character, and by their close touch with colonial feeling, would be able, upon all subjects submitted to them, to give really effective and valuable advice... *It might slowly grow to that Federal Council* to which we must always look forward as our ultimate ideal.

...But, of course, with the privilege of management and of control will also come the obligation and the responsibility. There will come *some form of contribution* towards the expense for objects which we shall have in common. That, I say, is self-evident, but it is to be borne in mind, even in these early stages of the consideration of the subject.

He insisted lengthily on the question of Imperial defence:

...We are looking to the colonies as still children, but rapidly approaching manhood... and to establish in the early days this principle of mutual support and of a truly Imperial patriotism, is a great thing of which our colonial statesmen may well be proud.

I shall be very glad to hear the views of the Premiers in regard to this question of any contribution which they think the colonies would be willing to make in order to establish this principle in regard to the naval defence of the Empire. As regards the military defence of the Empire, I am bound to say that we are still behindhand, although a great deal has been done in recent years... I would remind the Premiers assembled that if war breaks out, war will be sudden, and there will be no time for preparation then.

Therefore, it is of the first importance that we, all having a common interest, shoud have beforehand a scheme of common defence against any possible or at all events any probable enemy, and we ought to have these schemes of defence before us...

The interchangeability in the several groups is a matter of great importance, but how much greater it would be if there were interchangeability between the whole forces of the Empire, between the forces which you have in the several colonies and the forces of which you have seen some examples at home since you came to these shores!... If you have, as Canada has at Kingston, an important military College, it may be possible for us to offer occasionally to the cadets of that college commissions in the British Army...

This will enable the deluded Canadian to understand what the object was of bringing to the Jubilee those "guards of honour" composed of colonial militiamen. As far as commissioning the Canadian officers in the British Army, the scheme is now accomplished; and I was hardly rebuked in the House, last session, when I said that the Canadian people have not gone to the expense of building and keeping the Kingston Military College for the purpose of training military men for the British Army and depriving our own militia of their best officers. The following sentence will show what Mr. Chamberlain's idea was pointing at:

It seems to me possible that although in the first instance the idea is that such a Regiment coming to this country would come solely for that purpose—[drill and instruction]—and would not be engaged in military operations, yet if it were their wish to share in the dangers and the glories of the British Army and take their part in expeditions in which the British Army may be engaged, I see no reason why these colonial troops should not, from time to time, fight side by side with their British colleagues... (Pages 8 and 9.)

Mr. Chamberlain referred to the question of commercial relations. But there he found great difficulties in the way, on account of the wide difference between British and colonial fiscal policies.

The question of Imperial naval defence was presented by Mr. GOSCHEN, First Lord of the Admiralty. He spoke of the contribution of the Australasian Colonies, which, he said, would be more effective were it not hampered by the restrictions imposed upon it (1), and if the British authorities were given a free hand in the management of the Australasian ships. He added:

I value the principle which is involved in the contribution of the colonies to the Navy which was settled some years ago; and I think it would be a great pity and a retrograde step if such ties as have been established were to be cut. Sir Gordon Sprigg has sent us a very gracious proposal from the Cape, which shows the development of that system (2). We should be very glad to open up negociations with Canada, if not precisely on the same

(1) These restrictions consist mainly in the fact that the men-of-war are not allowed to sail out of Australasian waters.

(2) See page XXIV.

lines, because its situation is somewhat different, yet on other lines. (Page 16.)

The result of the Conference was not conspicuous at the time.

On the matter of commercial relations, the following resolutions were adopted:

1. That the Premiers of the self-governing Colonies unanimously and earnestly recommend the denunciation, at the earliest convenient time, of any treaties which now hamper the commercial relations between Great Britain and her Colonies.

2. That in the hope of improving the trade relations between the Mother country and the Colonies, the Premiers present undertake to confer with their colleagues with the view to seeing whether such a result can be properly secured by a preference *given by the Colonies* to the products of the United Kingdom. (Page 14.)

Mr. Chamberlain had evidently succeeded in placing this question on the basis adopted by Canada, — that of colonial love without reciprocal favours from the motherland.

On political relations, the resolutions adopted were as follows:

1. — The Prime Ministers here assembled are of opinion that the present political relations between the United Kingdom and the self-governing colonies are generally satisfactory under the existing condition of things.

Mr. SEDDON (New Zealand) and Sir E.-N.-C. BRADDON (Tasmania) dissented... because they were of opinion that the time had already come when an effort should be made to render more formal the political ties between the United Kingdom and the Colonies. The majority of the Premiers were not yet prepared to adopt this position, but there was a strong feeling amongst some of them that with the rapid growth of population in the colonies, the present relations could not continue indefinitely, and that some means would have to be devised for giving the colonies a voice in the control and direction of those questions of Imperial interest in which they are concerned equally with the Mother country.

It is interesting to compare this last paragraph with a speech delivered by Sir Wilfrid Laurier at Liverpool on the 12th of June, 1897 (1).

2. — They are also of opinion that it is desirable, whenever and wherever practicable, to group together under a federal union those colonies which are geographically united. — *Carried unanimously.*

3. — Meanwhile, the Premiers are of opinion that it would be desirable to hold periodical conferences of representatives of the colonies and Great Britain for the discussion of matters of common interest. — *Carried unanimously.* (Page 15.)

On the question of Imperial defence, the only resolution adopted was one in favour of the renewal of the arrangement between Great Britain and Australasia. (Page 18)

---

(1) See page IX.

It is proper, I think, to point out just now that the commercial question and the principle of colonial representation, even under the most primitive form, have remained at a standstill, while the question of colonial participation to the defence of the Empire has made enormous progress. The British authorities have succeeded in getting Kingston Cadets for the Imperial Army; they have established a recruiting station for the British Navy in Newfoundland; they have entered into negociations with the Canadian Government for the organisation of a naval reserve in Canada; — but, above all, they have realised their most cherished hope by inducing the colonists to "fight side by side with their British colleagues." The contrast between the progress of Military Imperialism in favour of Great Britain and the stagnation of Commercial Imperialism in favour of the Colonies, shall be found in the documents gathered in Chapters IV and V.

Some questions of minor interest were also discussed, and among those was the Pacific Cable. Details on this matter are to be found in Chapter VI.

At the last meeting, the Premiers unanimously adopted the following resolution:

> The Premiers, before they separate, beg to put on record their appreciation of the many courtesies which they have received at the hands of Mr. Chamberlain personally, and of the kind treatment which has been extended to them by the Government and people of the United Kingdom. (Page 19.)

On the 8th of July 1897, the Secretary of State for the Colonies wrote a letter to Lord Aberdeen, Governor General of Canada, congratulating the Canadian troops on their good appearance and discipline at the Jubilee. This letter was published *in extenso* in the Toronto *Globe*, July 24th, 1897, and contained the following paragraph:

> Her Majesty's Government feel that they are justified in hoping that the effects of this exceptional military gathering will be permanent, and that the Imperial and national interests which have been by this means so forcibly illustrated and brought home to the minds of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects will now be realised in a manner that has been scarcely possible before; they can hardly doubt that the events of the last few weeks will have done much to knit closer the bonds of union between the Colonies and the Mother country, and to this end the presence of the Colonial troops will have largely contributed.

2°. Speeches and Opinions of British and Colonial Statesmen.

MEETING OF THE "BRITISH EMPIRE LEAGUE"

LIVERPOOL, JUNE 12th, 1897.

As soon as they touched the British soil, the Colonial representatives were stormed by the British statesmen. As if it were to emphasise the real inspiration of the Jubilee festivities, the first reception granted to them was that of the "British Empire League," at Liverpool, on the 12th of June. The Duke of DEVONSHIRE, Lord President of the Council and President of the League, said:

...We are fortunate to-day in being able to be the first to receive on our soil the Premier of Canada, representing, as he does, not one of our self-governing colonies, but the federation of eight self-governing Colonies — a statesman whose acceptance by the whole of the Canadian people, English as well as French, Protestant as well as Catholic, is a symbol of the vitality and reality of the Federation. We receive him with still greater gratification, inasmuch as the first measure which he has proposed to his Parliament has been a step, and we believe a long step, in the way of closer commercial connection with this country, a proof of the desire of the Canadian statesmen, backed by the Canadian people, to add the strength which they have gained from a wise measure of federation to our strength, and to weld the bonds which unite us together more closely and, as we hope, more permanently...

Sir George TURNER, Premier of Victoria, said:

...We are not unmindful of the many benefits, privileges, and advantages which have been granted to our Colonies, and we are determined on this, that should the time ever unfortunately arrive when the British people here should require any definite and distinct proof that the sons of this nation in far distant lands still possess the feelings of loyalty to the motherland, we shall do what is right and proper in assisting that motherland (loud cheers). ...I can honestly say this — if ever the Colonies do leave the Empire it will not be the fault of the Colonies.

(*Times*, June 14th, 1897.)

BANQUET AT THE PHILARMONIC HALL

The Duke of Devonshire, the Colonial Premiers, and other distinguished visitors of the City were in the evening the guests of the Liverpool Incorporated Chamber of Commerce at a Banquet given in their honour at Philharmonic Hall.

The Duke of DEVONSHIRE said:

...We have at present an opportunity which may not within any very short time recur of hearing that which we ought to know respecting the feelings and the wants and the wishes and the views of our fellow country-

men in the Colonies, and that we shall better utilise that opportunity by endeavouring *to learn from them rather than to impress upon them our own views.* However close the connection between our Colonies and ourselves may be at the present time, however much closer it may come to be at some future time, it must be that our Colonies should know a great deal more about us than it is possible for us to know about them...

...I will only, before I sit down, once more express my opinion that the present time and the weeks which are to succeed to it may be a time of momentous importance to the British Empire. The future of that Empire depends almost, I think, in equal proportions upon considerations of material and of sentimental character. The unity which we desire will not be brought about, such unity as we possess will not be maintained, unless both parties feel that it is to their mutual interest and advantage, and I do not believe that even the ties of mutual advantage would be strong enough to cement the union of the Empire as we hope to see it, unless those considerations were supplemented by others of a more imaginative character. The proceedings of the next few weeks will, I think, afford material of both these characters, and I think we and our guests will both hear and say much which will strengthen the conviction that the continued and increased unity of the Empire is to the material advantage of both the United Kingdom and the Colonies.

...I do not think that it is possible that the masses of our people should remain indifferent to the presence among them of leading statesmen of great communities the magnitude of which they have scarcely up to the present time realised, surrounded as they will be by the representatives of *armed forces of the Crown, the existence of which they have hitherto scarcely known.* And I do not think that it can be without effect upon the *imagination of our guests* themselves when they will witness next Tuesday week the acclamation with which our Queen will be received in the crowded streets of London... Again, I do not think that any of our Colonial guests who will see, as they will see on the following Saturday, the display of the naval power of Great Britain will remain indifferent spectators of that demonstration. And I think that every one of them will feel more strongly than perhaps he has ever yet done that it is no mean thing to be a citizen upon equal terms of a State which possesses a naval power so unique and so unrivaled as that which they will see at Spithead...

The Hon. WILFRID LAURIER, after a general review of Canadian political history, said:

As thoughts of separation disappear, thoughts of union, of a closer union, take their place. To-day the sentiment exists in Canada in favour of a closer union with the motherland... What will be the future of these Colonies — what will be the future of the British Empire? The time may come — the time is coming probably when the present citizenship of the colonies, satisfied as they are with it at present, satisfactory as it is to them now, may become inadequate. The time may come when from the mere aggregation of numbers, and an increase of population, the sentiments and aspirations in favour of a closer union will have to be met and acknowledged and satisfied. What then will take place again? Gentlemen, I hardly venture to give my own opinion, but perhaps I may be pardoned for saying that in my own estimation, in my own views, and views largely held in the Colony from which I come, the solution may be found without coming into violent contact with the constitution of these realms, without disturbing the existing state of things, on the old British principle of representation...

This may be in the more or less distant future; but there is something which commands our immediate attention. Political union may be more or less distinct, but there is a duty depending upon all parts of the British Empire, and that is in favour of more extended commercial relations. I claim for the present Government of Canada that they have passed a resolution by which the products of Great Britain are admitted on the rate of their tariff at 12½%, and next year at 25% reduction. *This we have done not asking any compensation.* There is a class of our fellow-citizens who ask that all such concessions should be made for a *quid pro quo.* The Canadian Government has ignored all such sentiments. We have done it because we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain...

Sir H. M. NELSON responded for Queensland:

...He agreed with the sentiments which the noble Duke delivered that afternoon with regard to the trade of the Empire. He was one of those who believed that free trade was best for the whole world; but it was to be coupled with a very important condition, and that was that the whole world should accept it... With regard to protection, he must say that his sentiments and the sentiments of the people he represented amounted to this, that protection also was a policy that must be entertained with the greatest caution. When they found themselves surrounded by other nations who would not deal fairly with them, they must do something to protect themselves to a degree that was necessary to obtain fair and equitable trading conditions...

Mr. KINGSTON (Premier of South Australia) also responded:

...If some scheme could be happily arrived at between the Mother country and her Colonies by which those objects could be achieved, they in South Australia would be only too glad. They had been told that it was their duty to feed the hungry: they would be only too glad to discharge that duty with Australian meat. They had been told it was their duty to give drink to the thirsty; might they also entertain the pious aspiration that the day might soon come when the thirst of Great Britain might be more largely assuaged by the aid of Australian wines?

(*Times,* June 14th, 1897.)

The contrast is striking between the *sentimental* love of Canada, and the *practical* amity of Australia.

BANQUET AT THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE

LONDON, JUNE 18th, 1897.

The Prince of Wales and the members of the governing body of the Imperial Institute entertained the Premiers of Colonies at a banquet in the Institute last evening, at which a very large company was present. The Prince of Wales was in the chair, and the distinguished persons present included Lord Salisbury, Lord Rosebery, Mr. Chamberlain, M. P., etc., etc.

The idea of military help from the colonies began to take the lead.

The Marquis of LANDSDOWNE said:

...That Empire of which we were so proud would be but a mere empty phrase unless its citizens were prepared to hold and defend the splendid heritage which we possessed... No statesmanship, domestic or colonial, would desire to involve the Empire in war for any selfish or ignoble cause, but in a cause which was neither selfish nor ignoble the Mother country would be true to her Colonies and the Colonies would be true to the Mother country. *There was no reason to doubt as to the policy of the Colonies* and the great dependencies of the Empire. But it was necessary that there should be the frankest possible interchange of ideas between us and the Colonies as to the part which *they would severally have to play in the event of the calamity of war.* If the soldiers of the Colonies and our own should ever be called upon to stand side by side it was reasonable that the scheme of defence should be considered, and that the Colonies should have the advantage, when they were spending money generously for the purpose of Imperial defence, of the wider experience in military affairs of the Mother country. He could not help hoping that in the interval of hospitalities a short time might be found for conference on these important questions. He felt sure that as time went on there would be a closer drawing together of the bond which united the forces of the Colonies to those of the Mother country, and an ever-increasing sense of comradship between the officers and men of the different parts of the Empire.

The PRINCE OF WALES:

Gentlemen, this is not the time, nor is it necessary, for me to allude to the loyalty of our great Colonies. We have heard what has been spoken to-night, and we shall hear still more. We know that our Colonies look towards the Mother country with affection, and in the hour of need and danger I feel convinced that *they will always come forward to our assistance...*

The Hon. WILFRID LAURIER:

...Lord Lansdowne has spoken of a day when perhaps our Empire might be in danger. England has proved at all times that she can fight her own battles, but if a day were ever to come when England was in danger, let the bugles sound, let the fires be lit on the hills, and in all parts of the Colonies, though we might not be able to do much, whatever we can do shall be done by the Colonies to help her...

The Hon. G. H. REID (Premier of New South Wales):

...I think I may safely say in this company that there is no one who would desire to revert to the methods of Colonial administration which prevailed before the present reign. For the past forty or fifty years your wise and generous statesmanship has, I submit, produced splendid results. You have surrendered in many ways during that time Imperial control, but with that very surrender of Imperial control there has been a corresponding growth of Imperial power...

The Earl of ROSEBERY:

...I will venture to suggest to this great assembly — I speak now not as a member of the opposition but as a private person — I would venture to hope that this unparalleled gathering of Prime Ministers from every part of the Commonwealth of nations which is bound under the Crown should not separate without some effort being made to draw the bonds of Empire closer...

Lord SALISBURY:

...There is talk of fiscal union, there is talk of military union. Both of them, to a certain extent, may be good things. Perhaps we may not be able to carry them as far as some of us think, but in any case they will not be the basis on which our Empire will rest. Our Empire will rest on the great growth of sympathy, common thought, and feeling between those who are in the main the children of a common race, and who have a common history to look back upon and a common future to look forward to...

Sir George TURNER (Premier of Victoria):

...Perhaps, in the not far distant years that were to come — he hoped it might be in the lifetime of all who were present — they might see in existence in the British Dominions a Parliament which would be so representative as to be able to deal with the wants of all the Colonies and of the British Dominions, and yet be able to leave to the various Colonies the glorious privilege of looking after their own local affairs.

(*Times,* June 19th, 1897.)

The Toronto *Globe,* of June 19th 1897, published a special cable from London, June 18th., giving an account of the banquet of the Imperial Institute. The last paragraph read as follows:

All the morning papers contain editorials upon the banquet, which they agree in thinking a worthy and appropriate formal opening of the Jubilee festivities. All highly praise Mr. Laurier's eloquent speech, *especially his declaration that the Colonies would assist England in time of trouble.*

COMMENTS OF THE PRESS

The following are extracts from letters or telegrams to the Toronto *Globe.*

In the special cable dated London, June 22nd, and published in the *Globe* of the 23rd, appeared the following paragraph:

The *Times* and all the morning papers contain long telegrams from all the Colonies describing the enthusiasm in connection with the Jubilee *fêtes.* The editorials express a rather quiet satisfaction over the Jubilee honours, though the liberal organs betray some measure of disappointment. Literature is practically ignored. There is unanimous approval, however, of the honours conferred upon Colonial statesmen, and this is especially keen in the case of Mr. Wilfrid Laurier. The admission of the Premiers to the Privy Council is regarded as a sort of recognition of the right of the Col-

onies to share in the Imperial Councils. The *Daily Chronicle* says: "If, as we believe, this was Mr. Chamberlain's idea, we heartily congratulate him."

London, June 15th. — (Special.) — ...And note how soon the orchid finds its way into Mr. Laurier's buttonhole — and the orchid, as every one knows, has English political associations. Does the Canadian Premier think of that? He is told that he has chosen Mr. Chamberlain's favourite flower, and seems to like the sweet badge none the less for that. — (*Globe*, June 26th, 1897.)

London, June 16th. — (Special.) — From the *Daily Chronicle*. — "...Mr. Laurier stands out as a great object lesson in British rule, and no one who listens to his incisive and persuasive oratory can doubt that, judged by the standard of British statesmanship, he is an ideal spokesman for the people who have shown the path by which first each group of Colonies and then perhaps the Empire as a whole is destined to reach its full development. But the Imperial federation of which Mr. Laurier may prove the herald is far from that which has too often appropriated the name."

"There is something almost dramatic in the idea of Mr. Laurier as a leader — a half-unconscious leader perhaps — of this cause of Imperial unity. By birth, long descent and instinct he is a devoted French-Canadian." ... (*Globe*, June 30th, 1897.)

London, June 22nd. — It is well understood here that Premier Laurier accepted the distinction of Knighthood from Her Majesty only because it was the personal wish of the Queen that he should do so, and I may add that if Her Majesty's desire had been fully realised the Canadian Premier would have received yet higher honours. — (*Globe*, June 23rd, 1897.)

MR. CHAMBERLAIN AND THE COLONIAL PREMIERS

The Premiers of Canada, New South Wales, Victoria, New Zealand, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, and Cape Colony, who have come to England for the purpose of attending the Jubilee celebrations, paid a visit to Birmingham yesterday, and were entertained at luncheon by the Lord Mayor of Birmingham.

The Hon. WILFRID LAURIER said:

...He would say that it was generally believed throughout the Colonies that it was best for them and the motherland that there should be a more intimate connection between the two. Many schemes of union had been suggested, but they all had the fatal objection of interfering with the freedom of the trade of the Colonies. The Colonies had already granted certain concessions to the Mother country, and they asked for no *quid pro quo*, for no pound of flesh...

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said:

...I observed that Mr. Laurier, when he set foot upon these shores and in his first speech at Liverpool, while he spoke of the satisfactory character of the relations between the Colonies and this Country, nevertheless uttered a warning which it would be well to bear in mind, for he said that the situation as it is to-day could hardly be expected to last for ever, and that

either the Colonies would draw closer to us and would take a larger share in the Government and administration of the Empire, or else they might insensibly, and I hope unwillingly, drift apart. That is, in my opinion, the greatest problem with which the statesmen of the Empire have to-day to deal with. I hope that the feeling in the Colonies is the same as the feeling at home. I am certain that in the United Kingdom we all should feel that a separation between ourselves and any one of our Colonies would be not only a disaster, but it would be the greatest discredit that could fall upon us, and, if that feeling is shared by our kinsmen across the sea, then I do not doubt that our statesmen are capable of finding some effective means of giving a practical form to the aspirations which we have in common... If our self-governing colonies desire now or at any future time to take their share in the glories and in the responsibilities of Empire, they will find that we are ready to meet them more than half-way...

(*Times*, June 22nd, 1897.)

SIR GEORGE TURNER AT NORMANHURST

The hon. T.-A. BRASSEY and Lady Idina BRASSEY yesterday entertained several of the Colonial Premiers and their friends at Normanhurst, the seat of Lord Brassey.

Mr. Brassey submitted the toast — "The United Empire," — welcoming the guests in his father's name, as well as on behalf of Lady Idina Brassey and himself. The feeling in favour of Imperial unity was certainly much stronger than it was when he was in the Colonies a few years ago. Now that the desire for unity was strongly evoked, full advantage should be taken of the moment to strengthen that desire, or else it might wain. We could not expect monetary assistance from the Colonies for naval defence, but the Colonies could help *very materially with men.*

Sir George TURNER, in responding, said:

...Ultimately all the difficulties, all the troubles, all the lions in the path of that great movement of bringing the motherland and her Colonies more closely together would disappear. He did hope that before many years they would see a celebration in honour of the great unity of the Empire.

(*Times*, June 24th, 1897.)

OPINIONS OF SIR GEORGE TURNER

Sir GEORGE TURNER, Prime Minister of Victoria, has expressed the following views on colonial affairs to a representative of Reuter's Agency. On the subject of trade relations with the Mother country he said:

"Victoria is a heavily protected colony, and I do not suppose our people are prepared to give up protection... We cannot afford to relinquish our duties because we derive two millions annually, principally from *ad valorem* duties... Canada's recent action with regard to tariff is an experiment which we shall watch with great interest. All I can ask our people to do is to increase duties as against foreign countries. I think the majority of Victorians would be satisfied with such an arrangement so long as the Colony got some benefit in return."

(*Times*, July 5th, 1897.)

OPINIONS OF SIR EDWARD BRADDON

A representative of Reuter's Agency has had an interview with Sir Edward BRADDON, Prime Minister of Tasmania. Asked first for his views on the question of Imperial defence, Sir Edward said:

"My opinion is very much the same as it was at the time of the Sydney Conference of Premiers, last year, when it was agreed that until the Colonies were federated it would be very difficult to perfect a defence system. To make a force effective it is essential that it should be under the control of one officer acting as Commander-in-chief. At present each colony has its own small army — composed chiefly of volunteers — under its own local commandant. It seems to me for many reasons that federation must precede an effective Imperial defence scheme..."

Turning to the larger question of Imperial federation, Sir Edward Braddon, in reply to questions, expressed the following view:

"No doubt this question has been largely advanced and the feeling in favour of Imperial federation *strengthened by the splendid reception accorded to the Colonial Premiers* on Jubilee day. The interchange of views and conferences with Mr. Chamberlain must all help it forward to some extent. In the Colonies there are a number of people against Imperial federation; there are many in favour of it. So far as the Premiers are concerned, all that is now proceeding in London favours the idea that the number of those desirous of bringing this scheme to pass will be greatly increased. But Imperial federation must be a growth; it cannot be effected by a *coup-de-main*... Imperial federation, to be complete, must include the creation of a Federal Parliament at Westminster, in which the Colonies shall be fully represented. It is obvious that this cannot be done at once. But step by step — by an Imperial Council or other means — this end may be attained when the United Kingdom and the Colonies come to feel the necessity for it. Speaking for Tasmania, I believe, if put to the test, it would be found that the majority are in favour of Imperial federation. — (*Times*, June 26th, 1897.)

A COOLING DOUSE FROM SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH

Every one of the numerous functions where the British and Colonial statesmen met together was marked with effusions of the most tender love. A cooling douse was most timely thrown on that display of juvenile enthusiasm by Sir Michael Hicks Beach, Chancellor of the Exchequer. Several extracts from the Chancellor's speeches will be found in the following chapters; their characteristics are the clearness and the precision with which this eminent statesman has never failed to express his views with regard to what Imperialism should be: a system by which the Colonies would contribute to Imperial defence by supplying Great Britain with men and money, without expecting any favour in return.

On the 30th of June 1897, Sir Michael HICKS BEACH was banqueted at the Hotel Cecil, in London. Having described the Jubilee celebration as a strong demonstration of the feeling existing in Great Britain and in the Colonies in favour of a closer union, he said:

Another point arising out of the recent celebration was their navy, the strength of which, as they saw it last Saturday, was a source of pride to them and possibly a little source of envy to the foreigner. Their navy cost the tax-payers of this country £22,000,000 a year. Their navy not only defended the coasts of the United Kingdom: it defended their trade and commerce throughout the world, especially their trade with the Colonies, and it would assist the Colonies in repelling any foreign invasion. The Colonies were all great and growing nationalities. Canada had recently been described as a nation, and this was true, but did Canada contribute to the cost of the Imperial navy? When they came to business this was a question which would have to be very carefully discussed between Her Majesty's Government and the Premiers of their great self-governing Colonies, and he trusted that it might be satisfactorily solved.

Let them consider again the question of trade. He thought there was no more fascinating idea than that of an Imperial Zollverein; but hitherto the proposals on this subject that had come from the Colonies had been in conflict with England's established policy of free trade. Lately, however, Canada had proposed an arrangement of quite another kind which would not violate that established policy, but would recognise the great advantages which the Dominion had received in common with their other Colonies from this country's system of open ports, and would, at any rate, to some extent, return it by opening in some measure her ports to this country. That seemed to him a more possible agreement for their mutual benefit than anything which had hitherto been proposed, although there were difficulties in the way. He believed that the celebration of this year had done something towards making an advance in the direction of Imperial federation. He believed it had taught them, not merely their great common interest, but the principles on which that common interest was based — the principle of Empire and the principle of freedom. — (*Times*, July 1st, 1897.)

BANQUET OF THE COLONIAL INSTITUTE

LONDON, JULY 2d, 1897.

A Banquet was given last night at the Hotel Cecil by the Royal Colonial Institute to commemorate the 60th year of Her Majesty's reign...

Sir J. GORDON SPRIGG (Premier of Cape Colony), in proposing "The Naval and Military Forces of the Empire" said that...

...He could assure them that they in the outposts of the Empire, felt still more than those at home the necessity of having the power of the British navy to protect their coasts, and it appeared to him only reasonable that they should, according to their measure, in those distant outposts, contribute something so as to relieve the British tax-payer from the heavy charge imposed on him by the maintenance of the fleet, in whose maintenance those at the outposts of the Empire had an equal interest.

M. GOSCHEN (First Lord of the Admiralty) said:

...The question of the unity of the Empire had been one of the darling parts of his political creed. There were days when it was thought that the Colonies might be a burden to the Empire. Those were the days when it was thought that the Colonies possibly might prefer to be independent because they would not be exposed to the risks of a British war. Those craven ideas had vanished in these latter days. For the past thirty-three years he had seen year by year the growth of that idea which he believed would

largely affect the future of the Empire. He did not wish on a festive occasion to touch upon the financial point, to which Sir Gordon Sprigg had rather seductively invited them. It was suggested to him by a great friend of the Colonies (1)—who was present that evening—when the colonial troops visited the fleet at Spithead, that there should be presented to them some rows of figures which would show how little the colonies contributed to Imperial defence. He, however, was unwilling to admit the idea, because it seemed to him that on a festive occasion one did not like to see leaflets distributed stating that contributions would be thankfully received. And so, on that occasion, he would only appeal to the loyalty and liberality of their fellow-subjects...

(*Times*, July, 3rd, 1897.)

THE COLONIAL PREMIERS AND THE NATIONAL LIBERAL CLUB

LONDON, JULY 3d, 1897.

A luncheon was given on Saturday by the National Liberal Club in honour of the Colonial Premiers, and it was attended by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir George Turner, Mr. R.-J. Seddon, Sir Hugh Nelson, Mr. C.-C. Kingston, Sir E. Braddon, and Mr. H. Escombe.

Lord KIMBERLEY, in proposing "Our Guests, the Premiers":...

...There might be and there would be very many difficult questions to solve in the future, before they could achieve, possibly in some future day, a still closer union, but with the temper that now prevailed and with the conviction of the people of this country that it was *from the Colonies* especially that the movement must come for a closer union — a movement which would be readily met by this nation — with that conviction he strongly believed that those who were to succeed them would be wise and prudent enough, and would have patriotic feelings enough, to bring about a closer union than now existed. He coupled with the toast the name of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Sir Wilfrid LAURIER, who was warmly received, thanked Lord Kimberley and those present for the kind manner in which the Colonies had been spoken of... At the present time the race he represented was loyal to the Crown of England. He said so not with any sycophancy, but because they were free, and so long as they were free they would be loyal. If he had another thought to add it was that while he did not believe in the Parliament of man he believed in the Parliament of Greater Britain, and it would be the proudest day of his life — he could not hope to live long enough to see it, but some of those who were in Canada that day might live to see it — to see a Canadian of French descent promoting the principle of freedom in that Parliament of Greater Britain.

Commenting editorially on these speeches, the *Times* said:

...These communities are now ready to draw closer the ties that bind them into one Empire, as soon as the wisdom of statesmen, the maturing of public opinion, and the growth of material links shall enable effect to be given to the wishes shared by all. *It is not yet clear* how that Parliament of Greater Britain is to be constituted, to which Sir Wilfrid Laurier looks forward with prophetic visions...

(*Times*, July 5th, 1897.)

---

(1) Sir John COLOMB (see page LXXV).

SIR WILFRID LAURIER AND THE COLONIAL PARTY

That ordinary Parliamentary proceedings are for the moment eclipsed by the questions of wider Imperial importance brought into prominence by the visit of the Colonial Premiers was shown yesterday when far more interest was evinced in the burden of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's address to the Colonial Party than in the report stage of the Workmen's Compensation Bill... The Chairman, in introducing Sir Wilfrid Laurier, stated that there were five points upon which it was felt that discussion would be profitable: 1st, The representation of the Colonies in the Imperial Parliament; 2nd, trade on mutually preferential terms between the Mother country and the Colonies; 3rd, Asiatic Immigration; 4th, the laying and protection of a Pacific Cable; and 5th, Imperial penny postage.

Sir Wilfrid LAURIER, in an address lasting three quarters of an hour, dealt in detail with the topics thus enumerated. In regard to the first point, he expressed the view that the time had arrived when the great self-governing Colonies should be directly represented either in the Imperial Parliament or in some grand national Council or federal legislative body, genuinely representative of the Empire as an organised entity. The assured and permanent unity of the Empire, he maintained, demanded a revision of the present situation in this respect. As to the form in which representation would be acceptable to the Colonies, he was not prepared to give an opinion; but possibly some scheme similar to that of the American Constitution, under which Territories were represented in Congress by members who could speak and advise, *but could not vote* (!) until their constituencies attained the dignity of States, might prove a stepping-stone towards a solution of the difficulty. One thing was certain — the national sentiment in the Colonies in this connection was growing stronger every day and could not be overlooked. It was a question that would have to be faced. In answer to a remark interjected by Mr. Hogan, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said that no doubt when Australia and South Africa were confederated like Canada, the problem of Colonial representation in the Imperial Parliament would be much simplified. — (*Times*, July 6th, 1897.)

The report communicated to us of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech to the Colonial party at the House of Commons on Monday made the Hon. Gentleman express the view that the time had arrived when the great self-governing Colonies should be directly represented either in the Imperial Parliament or in some grand national Council or federal legislative body genuinely representative of the Empire as an organised entity. This should have been "the time would arrive," etc. — (*Times*, July 7th, 1897.)

That same extraordinary idea of having the Colonies represented in the Imperial Parliament by delegates deprived of voting power was taken up in the House of Commons, by Mr. Trevelyan M. P., on the 3rd of April 1900. (1)

---

(1) See *Colonial Representation*, pages CIII—CIV.

MEETING OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE LEAGUE

LONDON, JULY 5th, 1897.

The Duke of Devonshire presided yesterday at Merchant Tailor's Hall over a meeting convened by the British Empire League, of which His Grace is President, "To welcome the Colonial Premiers in the City of London." The Premiers present were Mr. R.-J. Seddon, (New Zealand), Sir Wm. Whiteway, (Newfoundland), etc.

The Duke of DEVONSHIRE said:

...I have said that the proof is abundant of the desire of a more effective national unity which exists here in this country. We know equally well that it exists to the same extent in those portions of the Empire which lie across the sea. Not only have we the speeches delivered by our Colonial visitors — men whom we are entitled to regard as speaking with authority not their own opinions only, but also those of the populations and the countries whom they govern, and whom they represent here — not only have we these utterances all in the same tune, but, if confirmation were needed, in the reports we daily receive in the telegrams about the celebration of the 60th year of Her Majesty's reign in every part of the world, we learn that they have in no degree misrepresented or exaggerated the feeling in favour of Imperial unity which exists in the British Dominions in every part of the world... It is satisfactory, I think, to know that the recent weeks — the present time is not entirely given up either by ourselves or by our visitors to great historical pageants or to festivities and mutual congratulations. The opportunity has been taken of the presence of the distinguished colonial statesmen among us, some of whom we are able to welcome here to-day — the opportunity has been taken by the Minister who is responsible for our colonial relations not only to have interviews with each of them individually — interviews necessarily of a confidential character upon matters relating to their own especial country — but also to hold meetings of them collectively, meetings which also up to the present time have been of a confidential nature, but at which questions of a more general character, *affecting the whole range of our relations*, have been considered and discussed. As I have said, up to the present time those meetings have been entirely confidential. The time may come when it may be found possible to make some public statement respecting the tenour and character of those discussions or the conclusions which have been arrived at.

Whether this be so or not I do not think I am violating any confidence when I say that the subjects which these Colonial Statesmen have been invited to discuss with Mr. Chamberlain are to a very great extent similar to, if not absolutely identical with, those contained in the Constitution of the British Empire League — the extension of our trade with the Colonies, the effect of existing laws and treaties upon our commercial relations with each other, the subject of communications between the Mother country and the Colonies, or between the Colonies themselves, by means of steamships or of telegraphs, the subjects of postal communications,— *above all*, the subject of Imperial naval and military defence...

Mr. SEDDON, after thanking them warmly for their hearty reception to himself and the other Premiers present, said that the good work done by the British Empire League had been appreciated by every well-wisher of the Empire. He might go further and say that the presence of the Col-

onial Premiers that day in the Mother country was in a great degree owing to the exertions and work of the League. As to their discussions with Mr. Chamberlain, he was not at liberty to speak freely. The questions which had been propounded and asserted by the League were nearer to fruition than many present anticipated... The attitude of the Colonies in the past proved that they were with the Motherland. It had been said that sentiment should count for little, but sentiment must ever count for much; and the Colonies — those in the distant parts of the Empire must not have their loyalty gauged by the amount they were able to contribute to either defence or any other purpose of the Empire... The conference now taking place between the Colonial Prime Ministers and the Imperial authorities sufficiently warranted him in saying that it was a practical test of the advantages of a closer connection between the Mother country and the Colonies. If we went further and said that later on, in the British Parliament, the ten millions who were at present disfranchised should be heard, he only said that which required to be developed and which would eventually take place...

Sir William WHITEWAY afterwards spoke:... It would be very advantageous if more were known of the colonists, socially and politically. A few years ago, for instance, when he and some colonists were in this country, a friend of his was asked whether he ate with them and how they were dressed (Laughter); and a telegram had just been received from Ireland containing an invitation to them to visit that country, but with the request that they should appear in their native costumes... They could hardly appreciate the work which they had to perform in the Colonies; and when they were *asked to give large amounts for the defence of the Empire*, they desired that all the circumstances of the position should be considered. If, however, England should ever be in any serious difficulty, the Colonies would not be backward in shedding their blood for her...

Mr. G.-H. REID (Premier of New South Wales), who arrived at this point, was called upon to speak:... It seemed to him that the history of the relations between the Mother-country and the Colonies showed that the less tightly the ties between them had been drawn, the fewer the official ties were, the larger and broader and more powerful were those other ties which lay deep in the nature of the British race.

Sir Edward BRADDON, in addressing the meeting, remarked that, as the President had observed, the Colonial Premiers were not in a position to speak freely... He was sure that Tasmania would be foremost of all the Colonies — a long way before the Colony represented by Mr. Reid — in joining closer together the bonds which united them with the Mother country. It was all very well to talk about loose bonds — they served very well now, when the Colonies were especially loyal; but the time must come, it would not be in his day, when one of two things must occur — that the Colonies must break away and set up their own nationhoods, or become members of the great British Empire. He would leave this country... bitterly disappointed if some step were not taken to forward that which would bring the Mother country and the Colonies closer together.

Col. George T. DENISON, President of the British Empire League in Canada, in proposing the election of Lord Salisbury as a Vice-President of the League, stated that at the present time in Canada the entire people were absolutely united on the general idea of the permanent unity of the British

Empire... Canada was the fifth mercantile marine power of the world, and the Dominion had a population of about 75,000 seafaring men. He asked the people of England to unite with Canada to press on the two Governments the taking of some steps by which those rugged, hardy mariners might be trained and educated for naval pursuits, in order that in case of war they might form a great naval reserve to assist if their services should ever be required.

(*Times*, July 6th, 1897.)

MINISTERS AND THE COLONIES

Last evening, the Master and Wardens of the Worshipful Company of Cordwainers gave a ladies banquet at the Hotel Cecil...

The Duke of DEVONSHIRE, proposed "The Naval and Military Forces of the Empire." He said:

...Certainly no progress — no adequate progress — can be made in the solution of the great question of Imperial defence in all its bearings unless the people of this Empire — whether they be the people inhabiting Great Britain or the more distant portions of the Empire across the sea — become more alive than hitherto to the essential conditions of the problem; and I do not think that a more practical step towards bringing home to the understanding and intelligence of the people of the conditions of that problem could have been taken than that which had just been taken of exhibiting to our colonial fellow countrymen the magnificence and strength of our naval power, which, if necessary, we could bring on any occasion to the defence of their shores. At the same time, by the representation which we have witnessed among us of the material which our Colonies possess of *organised forces* which will supplement the exertions of the navy, we have brought home to the minds of our people at home and to the minds of our fellow countrymen from the Colonies some of the most essential conditions of this problem...

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN proposed the next toast: "The British Empire."

...We hope that before long we may witness the federation of the great Australian Dominion. We believe that that would give such strength and influence to that portion of our Empire that it would be for the benefit of our Colonies, and would secure their future prosperity. If that be accomplished, as it may be at no distant date, it must be followed by the federation of the South African Colonies. These two important changes will undoubtedly be the first step towards the federation of the Empire. Meanwhile our business — the business of British Statesmen — is to remove obstacles and to lay the foundations of closer relations; and it is for our Colonies — for them alone — to decide when, in their opinion, the time has come that they shall take up their part in the noble heritage we have preserved for them as well as for ourselves, and if they desire at any time to share with us the glories and the privileges of empire — if they are willing to take on their shoulders their portion of the burden we have borne so long — they may rest assured that their decision will be joyfully received, their overtures will be cordially welcomed by the motherland...

Sir Wilfrid LAURIER, who was cordially greeted, in responding to the toast, remarked that Mr. Chamberlain had opened the subject which at that moment more than any other was engaging the attention of all races which

composed the British Empire. At no distant date it was manifest to all that the parting of the ways would be reached by England and her Colonies, and when the parting of the ways should have been reached the problem would be whether the Colonies should be more closely united with the Motherland or whether their relations should cease altogether. The Colonies had a national pride, and no tie and no bond would be permanent in the Colonies until it gave to its national pride the greatest possible expression. In Canada they had unbounded faith in their own country. When she had reached the full development of her manhood *nothing would satisfy her but Imperial representation.*

(*Times*, July 9th, 1897.)

One cannot help admiring the adroitness with which Mr. Chamberlain always puts forward the wish of the Colonies for closer union. When the question came before Parliament, however, as will be shown in chapters IV and V, it became quite clear that in the minds of British statesmen, closer union meant drawing help from the Colonies without any favour in return for the Colonies.

IMPERIAL DEFENCE.

At the Hotel Cecil, yesterday morning, a deputation, appointed by the IMPERIAL FEDERATION (DEFENCE) Committee, waited upon Sir J. Gordon Sprigg, Premier of Cape Colony, to present to him an address congratulating the people of Cape Colony on the resolution of their Legislature declaring that the time has arrived when steps should be taken to arrange some basis of contribution by the Colonies towards the Imperial navy...

Sir Charles DILKE, M. P., said that... There were many of them who felt that, however great might be the difficulty in the way of any closer political connection between the Colonies and the Mother country, *the truest and most practical form*, at the moment, *of Imperial federation was federation for the defence of the Empire* and for resisting any of those great strains which might come upon us. In that practical form of federation, Cape Colony, by its recent act, seemed to have taken the longest stride that had ever been taken up to the present time...

Sir J. Gordon SPRIGG, in reply, said he felt that the Committee in taking up the position which they did were standing upon sure ground. He could see that the unity of the Empire might be worked upon the grounds which the Committee mentioned. In this question of Imperial defence other suggestions had been brought forward with regard to commercial relations, *but in that matter he saw great difficulty.* — (*Times*, July 10th, 1897.)

COLONIAL PREMIERS AND COMMERCE.

LONDON, JULY 9TH, 1897.

The London Chamber of Commerce entertained the Colonial Premiers last evening to a dinner at the Hotel Metropole. Sir Albert-K. ROLLIT, M. P., President of the Chamber, occupied the chair...

Sir John FORREST proposed "The Defensive Forces of the Empire." He remarked that those who were not strong would in a time of difficulty have to go to the wall and he therefore hoped that in this great country and in all parts of the Empire they would not be lulled into a false security in time of peace. If those who lived in a far off part of the world wanted to have any voice whatever in the control of the destinies of this great Empire, to which they were so proud to belong, they must throw in their lot altogether with it, and bear their share of the responsibilities...

The CHAIRMAN then proposed the toast of the evening — "The Colonies and Commerce and our colonial guests"...

...They had learned the beauty of helping on the development of their colonies by their capital, and the Colonies had reciprocated by repaying that capital and paying the interest upon it in the shipment of goods, which was the first great step towards commercial union. He might add that if England had kept to that *instead of lending money to foreign countries* and experiencing the sad truth that there were peoples, like individuals, of whom it might be said that it was not their interest to pay their principal nor their principle to pay their interest, they would be in some respects in a better financial position than they were in that day...

There were other questions — that of naval defence, with all its responsibility; that of British Cables; and, further, there was the question whether, if obligations of an Imperial character were contracted, as in naval defence, the corollary of representation in the Councils of the Empire ought not to accompany the contribution of the various Colonies. Their statesmen must face and not shirk this problem.

Mr. G.-H. REID, in responding to the toast, remarked that Sir John Forrest did not at all represent the sentiment of the people of Australia when he spoke of them as being anxious to join in the partnership of what was called Imperial federation. The term was a beautiful one — like Mesopotamia — but he never yet heard from any statesman or body of statesmen, or even a league, a definition of what it really meant. The people of Australia, like the people of this country, had become accustomed to manage their own affairs. They gloried in their equality with the people of England, and any attempt to bring the Colonies back to a relative position which would make them insignificant — which would make them some indefinite minor quantity at Westminster — would never succeed in Australia... The English people need not get anxious about drawing closer the ties between the Colonies and the Mother country. Sometimes the greater the number of ties the more irksome such connection became. When they thought of the glories of this great country and of the recent magnificent spectacle of concord and loyalty, which had excited the admiration of their bitterest enemies, he asked them to think twice before they manufactured fresh ties. It was not the official connection — not the Governor — in New South Wales; it was not the Sovereign on the Throne which bound the British together, because behind all these benificent institutions there lay that which did bind them — the same blood, the same history, the same traditions, and the same future.

Sir E. BRADDON also responded to the toast:... There was no doubt whatever about the intense loyalty and devotion of the people of the Colonies to the Mother country, but in the future one of two things must happen — either the ties between them would be drawn closer, or the Colonies, as they grew and expanded, would drift asunder from the Mother country. There was nothing that he should deplore more than that. His policy would always be in favour of Imperial Federation, but, at the same time, when

the Colonies and especially when the Mother country was ripe for it, there should be that representation of the Colonies and all parts of the British Empire in an Imperial Parliament, which meant Imperial Federation. He did not agree in the minor view of Mr. Reid. He believed that the Colonies would take a higher view, and a view which he hoped would be taken was that the closest union possible should be effected between Australasia and the Mother country.

(*Times*, July 10th, 1897.)

THE COLONIES AND THE NAVY.

GIFT OF A BATTLESHIP.

Five of the Colonial Premiers were, on Saturday night, the guests of the members of the St. George's Club, at a dinner held at the Club house, Hanover Square, W. Lord LOCH, the President, occupied the chair, and the Premiers present were Sir H.-M. Nelson, Sir J. Gordon Sprigg, Sir E.-N.-C. Braddon, Sir J. Forrest, and Mr. H. Escombe.

The toast of "The Army, Navy, and Reserve Forces" was proposed by Sir E.-N.-C. BRADDON, who said that... He was not without hope that the Army, Navy, and Reserve Forces would secure that closer union, that greater consolidation of the Empire which they all desired to see. He was an Imperial federationist — he believed in a complete unity of this great Empire. The people of the Australasian colonists were at the present time loyal to the core, and he did not want to see them cool in their loyalty by reason of politicians and statesmen not seizing opportunities which presented themselves to weld them together more closely with their fellows of the Mother country...

The Duke of CAMBRIDGE... responded for the Army. He said:... Although we might not have a very large Army at home, we knew that we had the great assistance, should it be called for, of the various colonies... England was now in the glorious position of knowing that she was able to ward off danger, from whatever quarter it might threaten, and that position should be strengthened by drawing as close as possible the bond of union between the Colonies and the Mother country, and showing to the world that we were a combined Empire, and not a nation merely dependent on isolated efforts.

Mr. GOSCHEN, responding for the Navy, said:

...To-day I have had an interesting scene, a simple scene, but one which will come home to all of you. I received the present of an ironclad at the hands of a British Colony. There was no ceremonial, there was no great reception, there was no blare of trumpets; but Sir Gordon Sprigg simply came to the First Lord of the Admiralty and told him that the Cape Colony was prepared to place an ironclad of the first class at the disposal of the Empire. I thank him on behalf of the English nation, I thank him on behalf of the Government, and I thank him also on behalf of the Empire at large, of which the Cape Colony is so distinguished a part... That offer of a first class battle-ship is accompanied by no conditions, but it is proposed that that ship shall take its place side by side with those sister ships, paid for by the British tax-payer, which many of you have seen at Spithead. No conditions attach to it; it is a free gift intended to add to the power of

the British Empire. I value the gift of the Cape Colony specially for two reasons—one political and the other strategical. I value the political principle which it acknowledges of the community of interests between the Colonies and the Mother country, and I value the strategical principle — that the best plan to assist the power of the British navy, the best plan to defend the Colonies, is to leave an entirely free hand to the central authority which organises Imperial defence. I value the political principle not on financial grounds. Whether the contributions are large or small the real point is this — that the Colonies acknowledge the community of interests. As I ventured to say the other night, it has not always been so. There was a time when the Colonists thought that their interests might be separate from the Mother country, and, if we were engaged in war with European powers, the best plan for the colonists would be to stand aloof. Those ideas have vanished entirely in the present day; those ideas have been buried with many other prejudices and a different creed prevails to-day... We do not wish to turn the enthusiasm of the Jubilee into cash; we do not wish to press on this occasion for contributions in money from the Colonies *except for this purpose* — not merely to relieve the British tax-payer. I put that entirely aside — an acknowledgement of the principle that the Colonies, like ourselves, are interested not only in their own ports, not only in the commerce which clusters round their islands, but they are interested in this nation being strong, and they recognise that the foreign policy of the Colonies must be backed up by the Imperial navy; for a foreign policy without a navy would be committed to a principle of weakness which neither the Colonies nor the Mother country would ever be prepared to accept...

The Marquis of LORNE, replying for the "Reserve Forces," remarked that it was one of the best signs of the times that in our great Colonies now there was a trained body of citizen-soldiers able to take the field when any danger might threaten Great Britain.

The CHAIRMAN next proposed the toast of the evening — "The Premiers of Her Majesty's self-governing Colonies." He said that the Premiers now present in this country would have realised the strong desire on the part of the people of this country to draw as close as possible the bond of union with the Colonies which they represented.

...Years ago he took part in the negociations which were carried out in Australia for the establishment of that naval contingent to which Mr. Goschen had referred. He was associated at that time with Sir George Tryon, who, in his communications with the Premiers of some of the Colonies pointed out that the true defence of Australian waters was not by keeping the ships which were then to be constructed at the expense of the Colonies within Australian waters, but that possibly the best defence for those waters might even be in the Chinese seas, and that it was necessary that the admirals should have power to send the ships to *whatever part of the world* their services could be best used in. The action of Cape Colony and that taken by the Australasian Colonies were a symbol of their desire for unity with the Mother country. Knowing, as he did, the patriotic and loyal feeling of the people of the Australian Colonies, he had not the slightest doubt that they would renew in some form or other their contribution to the Imperial defence of the Empire...

Sir Gordon SPRIGG responded for the Cape of Good Hope:

The proposal which he, as First Minister of the Government, was privileged to make to the First Lord of the Admiralty was an illustration of how

they were welding together the different nationalities in Cape Colony. It was a matter which was discussed in the Cape Legislature, where there were a large number of Dutch members, and the proposal was brought forward there by an independent member. It was supported by himself, and other members of the Government to the utmost of their power, and it was carried through without any division... The carrying out of the proposal was contingent upon the ratification of the Legislature of Cape Colony, but he felt the utmost assurance that when the Legislature met next year the gift would be ratified, and that they would have the great satisfaction of knowing that they had contributed to the navy, which was the great instrument in creating the Empire, and that by which the Empire was being to be maintained.

Sir John FORREST replied for Western Australia... The Colony which he represented was prepared to continue its contributions to the Imperial navy. Britons must defend their commercial relations and assist one another to the utmost of their power. Personally, he had never ceased to try to inculcate amongst the people of Western Australia a spirit of love and admiration for the Mother country, and he had always felt the same good will towards the people of England that he felt at the present time. He hoped that as time went on there would be found a means of knitting more closely together the various parts of the Empire into one harmonious whole. (*Times,* July 12th, 1897.)

The Australian Premiers did not evidently accept the suggestion made to them by Mr. Goschen and Lord Loch to abandon to the British Admiralty the full control of the Australian squadron. The *Times* gave expression to the disappointment felt by the British authorities in an article published the same day, from which the following extract is taken:

It is to be feared from the remarks of Mr. KINGSTON, the Premier of South Australia, and from certain observations dropped by some other influential Australian politicians, that, notwithstanding the unanimous view of naval experts and the attempts of Lord Brassey and others to popularise it in our great Southern Colonies, the *old mistaken notion* that local interests can be best defended locally still survives to some extent amongst Australians. Possibly the example of Cape Colony, as intelligent as it is courageous and generous, may induce them to abandon a theory which goes far to diminish the utility of the large sacrifices they have made, and which, we doubt not, they will be ready, when the time comes, to renew.

It may be noted here that Lord BERESFORD did not approve of the principle laid down by the Government of Cape Colony, when they offered a battleship to the British Naval authorities. The Toronto *Globe* of July 27th, 1897, published a letter from its London correspondent, in which I read the following:

It was said in a former letter that the Cape Colony's offer of a first class battleship to the British Navy, though highly appreciated, was not regarded by Naval experts as the best plan of promoting the object in view. This statement is confirmed by a letter from Lord Charles BERESFORD, who says the generous and magnificent gift of an ironclad presented by the Cape

rightly deserved all the praise and kindly sentiments which it had evoved in this country. He should be very sorry, however, if the patriotic zeal and loyalty so splendidly exhibited at the Cape were to form a precedent for future contributions from the Colonies towards Imperial defence... In his opinion, both for strategical and political reasons, it would be a far reaching, if not fatal, mistake to accept the principle that the best contribution of the Colonies in aid of Imperial defence would be in the direction of supplying money for either building or maintaining ships of the fleet. A very ackward state of affairs might arise if this principle was largely extended. During war, it was quite likely that it might be necessary to remove the fleet from colonial waters. If during its absence a hostile cruiser bombarded the colonial coast towns it was idle to think that in such a case there would not be friction, soreness, and some misunderstanding among those colonists who had paid towards the expenses of that fleet. He was most strongly of opinion that colonial contributions to Imperial defence should consist entirely of local naval bases under their own control, thoroughly equipped in every detail, that would enable a fleet to refit and repair damages quickly. Grand, generous, chivalrous, as the suggestion from the Cape must be regarded, he could not but help thinking that the million necessary to build and equip a first class battleship would be far more beneficially expended for Imperial defence if used to make the Cape a more efficient naval base.

OPINION OF HON. G. W. REID.

It may have been noted that as the ardour of the other colonial representatives was growing in intensity, Mr. Reid was asserting his dissenting views more strongly. On the 12th of July, the Earl of Selborne, Under-Secretary for the Colonies, presided at a complimentary dinner to the Premier of New South Wales.

Admiral Sir N. BOWDEN-SMITH, in responding for the Navy, said it should not be forgotten that the Colonies of Australia and New Zealand were the first to contribute towards the maintenance of the Imperial navy in their own waters, an example that had now been followed by the Cape. He hoped that when the present agreement with Australia expired it would be renewed in a liberal spirit on both sides. They ought to remember that, in the event of a war with a great naval power, the interest of the Colonies might possibly be served by the fleet, which was stationed in Australian waters, fighting some battle a considerable distance from the shores of the Colonies themselves...

MR. REID said that:

Many of their most zealous lovers of Imperial unity — men with the noblest motives, — seemed to wish to drag them forward into that future to which the Chairman had referred, in company with a number of projects for which, he thought, there was still some room for consideration. He had never ceased to admire the zeal with which many very splendid proposals had been advocated for, for instance, providing for the representation of Australia and the other self-governing colonies in the Houses of Parliament; and in some of his more romantic moments he had almost come to picture the presence of the most noble the Duke of Woolloomooloo side by side with

the distinguished Lords he saw on either side of him. He confessed, seeing how Parliaments worked at present, the spectacle of another union of Parliaments was too appalling... It had always seemed to him that complete as were our Parliamentary institutions and those of the Colonies, the blending of these two perfections might be attended with mischievous consequences... To those who were anxious to introduce startling changes in the relations between the different parts of the Empire — which, he admitted, did seem unsatisfactory to the eye, but which in the course of every day life he submitted had worked most admirably — he thought they had a right to ask for some substantial proof that the present relations could be improved. He said that he greatly admired the liberal offer which was made on Saturday by the Premier of the Cape. No offer could be more timely or more welcome, because it was the Cape which was giving us all the trouble. They in Australia had given the Mother country very few naval or military anxiety, but the colony which he represented had spent something like £500,000 in providing a naval base for the fleets of Her Majesty in the Pacific. Then the Australian Colonies contributed an amount per annum which would represent £3,000,000 or £4,000,000 worth of warships. After stating that the naval agreement with Australia was sure to be renewed, he said he cheerfully recognised, and heartily reciprocated, the magnificent generosity of spirit which was shown by the people of England towards the Colonies, and just as the statesmen and people of England pledged themselves to stand by the Colonies in the time of extremity, to the last man and to the last shilling, so they, as no unworthy scions of the same stock, said to the people of England that, few as they were to-day, and slender as were their financial resources, if the time of danger came on our race we should find that the spirit which animated us in our treatment of them would be shown by them under the same flag.

(*Times*, July 13th, 1897.)

Mr. Reid insists most emphatically on the mutual pledge: "*just as the statesmen and people of England pledged themselves to the last man an to the last shilling.*" Before pledging Canada to British wars, we might have ascertained how many men and how many shillings England would be ready to risk in defending Canada against the United-States, our only possible enmemy?

THE CANADA CLUB.

JULY 14TH, 1897.

A dinner was given last night at the Albion Tavern by the Canada Club. Sir Robert Gillespie presided, and the company included Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Donald Smith, Sir Louis-H. Davies, etc.

Sir Wilfrid LAURIER said that... Very kind reference had been made to the soldiers of Canada during their short stay in England. Might their hope be gratified that the scourge of war might disappear from the earth, but if it should be the misfortune of the British Empire to be engaged in war, no matter with what country, he was sure that the Canadian soldiers would give a good account of themselves.

(*Times*, July 15th 1897.)

THE COLONIAL PREMIERS IN PARIS.

Paris, July 19th. — ...The British Chamber of Commerce had the happy idea of inviting them —[the Colonial Premiers]— to a banquet to meet the British Colony here...

Sir Wilfrid LAURIER...

While remaining French, he was profoundly attached to British institutions. Speaking for his fellow-countrymen, he could vouch that they were satisfied with their existing institutions and with their present rule. But those relations could not remain forever unaltered. The day would come when, by the force of events and the development of the colony, the ties now so slight between Canada and Great Britain must be modified, and Canada would aspire to a higher position. The problem would then have to be solved by the Mother country. The existing ties would either have to be severed or to be drawn closer. If the problem should be solved, which was not improbable, by Imperial representation, Canada would at no price accept anything depriving it of its legislative autonomy. It was permissible, however, to hope that the solution of the problem would be a closer union with the Mother country, and if this took the shape of Imperial representation, it would be a glorious day to see Canada represented in the Federal Parliament by a descendant of the French race.

Mr. G.-H. REID said:...

The patriotic display made recently by all parts of Greater Britain in honour of our illustrious Queen has quickened a desire in some quarters for closer political and commercial relations, but, so far, no definite policy worthy of serious consideration has been unfolded. As for political ties, the truth may resemble a paradox, but it is the fact that the more slender the official tie has become the less has been the strain upon it, so that the virtual independence of the self-governing colonies has brought about a degree of Imperial solidarity without precedent in history. As for commercial ties, the trade of Greater Britain is mainly with the United Kingdom, and the slight changes possible scarcely call for a policy of adventure...

Sir J. Gordon SPRIGG said:...

One word on Greater Britain. I believe that the ties uniting us among ourselves and with the Mother country will become closer and closer, so that at a given moment we shall feel that we form but one family in this great and glorious Empire, over which Queen Victoria has reigned with such unparalleled success.

Commenting on the above speeches, the *Times* of the same date said:

It will be noted that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has once again expressed his belief that the day must come when, by the force of events, the Colonies, or Canada at all events, will be compelled to seek for the establishment of closer relations with the Mother country...

In another article devoted especially to " Canada and the Empire " the *Times* said:

No figure has been more prominent or more honoured among the Colonial representatives than that of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Canadian Premier...
Sir Wilfrid Laurier has responded to the sympathetic movement of this country by taking the lead in a movement towards some closer form of Imperial union. He alone of all the Colonial Premiers at present in this country has ventured to suggest in public speech the desirability of representation of the Colonies in the Imperial Parliament of the future. That he should do so is particularly interesting as indicating the direction in which Colonial evolution under present conditions may tend...

In a letter dated July 20th 1897 and published on the 23rd, the special correspondent of the *Times* in Paris gave the report of a long interview which he had with Sir Wilfrid Laurier just before the banquet of the Chamber of Commerce. The following is an extract from Sir Wilfrid's declarations:

I shall perhaps be led into saying something to-night on the federal idea now occupying English minds. As for us, we are quite satisfied with our present situation. We are gaining in prosperity and strength. We feel ourselves independent, and we cling all the more to the Mother country because we seem to be acting quite freely. Perhaps one day, in five or ten or twenty years, when we are twelve or fifteen millions, we may be hampered by our present situation. Then the federal idea will present itself quite naturally. And then, I am convinced, the best way of realising this idea will be found. A Parliament will perhaps be created, in which both the Colonies and the Mother country will be proportionately and equitably represented, and in which common interest will be discussed with full respect for the interest of each. But, for the moment, we have brought to the Mother country an incontestable demonstration of our loyalty, and the whole world must have been the witness of it.

II.

Contribution of the Colonies to the South African War.

1o. Interpretation in Canada.

The secret intrigues which have preceded the sending of Canadian troops to South Africa, have been invariably denied in official circles. As one may well believe, those operations were not performed in open light, on Parliament square, and they could not be easily detected in newspaper reports or public speeches. I find, however, in perusing the newspapers of July 1899, a few paragraphs which raise a corner of the curtain behind which M. Cecil Rhodes' agent was exerting his efforts to secure the adhesion of Canada to his master's policy.

On the 11th of July, the Montreal *Star* announced Allen's arrival in Canada:

> Mr. Allen's object in coming to Canada at the present juncture is to enlist the sympathy and support of the Canadian people in the work which his countrymen in Africa are carrying on. Already, he says, the Australian colonies have moved in the matter, and have, by a series of resolutions, asked the Imperial Government to protect the rights of British subjects in Paul Kruger's republic. Mr. Allen is desirous of obtaining a similar pronuncio from Canadians.

The following day, the same organ had another interview with Allen:

> Mr. Allen, it may be remarked, comes to this country for the purpose of interesting the Canadian people in the South African question and show them that as members of the Empire they have a direct interest in South Africa.

In any country where people are not thoroughly prepared to be humbugged without enquiring a little in the matter, this would not have been an easy task.

The Uitlanders' delegate went on:

The objects of the Imperial South African Association of which the Right Hon. Lord Windsor is president, are to uphold british supremacy and to promote the interests of british subjects in South Africa, with full recognition of colonial self government. (1)

The masters' thought was coming out through the agent: it was already decided that the South-African Republic was to be a british colony.

Coming to practice I am convinced that nothing would more contribute to a pacific and satisfactory solution of the South African question than an expression of opinion from Canada similar to that which came from Australia in May last. The Australians have convinced Mr. Kruger and the Imperial Government, by public meetings and through the press, that they regarded as a matter of moment that their fellow countrymen in the Transvaal should be admitted to political equality with the Boers, and that british supremacy should be maintained throughout South Africa.

And then, on the 22nd, the *Star* had the following despatch from Ottawa:

Mr. J. Davis Allen, delegate of the Imperial South African Association, delivered an address in one of the Senate committee rooms last night to senators and members of Parliament on the South African crisis. Sir MacKenzie Bowell occupied the chair. Mr. Davis Allen is a delegate of the Imperial South African Association. The meeting was an enthusiastic one, the object being to get Parliament to pass resolutions in favour of the Uitlanders.

The Toronto *Globe* had, on the 24th, a short paragraph on this matter:

A VISITOR FROM JOHANNESBURG.

As a result of the presence in Ottawa of Mr. J. Davis Allen, the representative of the Uitlanders Association of Johannesburg, it is probable that an effort will be made to have the Dominion Parliament pass a resolution of sympathy with the aliens residing in the Transvaal. *It is not probable* that the Government will consider it advisable to ask Parliament to give unsolicited advice to the Imperial Government or to pass what would be an opinion on a matter of grave international importance.

A week later, Mr. Allen had succeeded in bringing to his terms the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, and the whole representation in both Houses. On the 31st of July, after a few minutes, — not of discussion — but of oration and patriotic singing, the Canadian Parliament solved a problem which had occupied the attention and anxieties of British statesmanship for nearly a century; and the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

---

(1) For the names of the Canadians who enlisted in this association, see page CXXXIV.

1. Resolved, That this House has viewed with regret the complications which have arisen in the Transvaal Republic, *of which Her Majesty is suzerain*, from the refusal to accord to Her Majesty's subjects now settled in that region, any adequate participation in its government;

2. Resolved, That this House has learned with still greater regret that the condition of things there existing has resulted in intolerable oppression, and has produced great and dangerous excitement among several classes of Her Majesty's subjects in her South African possessions;

3. Resolved, That this House, representing a people which has largely succeeded, by the adoption of the principle of conceding equal political rights to every portion of the population, in harmonising estrangements and in producing general content with the existing system of government, *desires to express its sympathy with the efforts of Her Majesty's Imperial authorities* to obtain for the subjects of Her Majesty who have taken up their abode in the Transvaal such measure of justice and political recognition as may be found necessary to secure them in the full possession of equal rights and liberties.

(*Debates*, House of Commons, 1899, Vol. III, page 8994.)

The apparent purpose of this resolution was to supply the Uitlanders with a new argument and enable them to point to Canada as a country where, under British rule, different races could live on equal terms of citizenship. I need not say, however, that this resolution never went to South Africa. It remained in Mr. Chamberlain's pocket-book, so as to be used, first, as an argument against his political opponents in England, and second, as a pledge from Canada to supply armed help when the time came of sanctioning by force the principle laid down in the resolution.

Let us see how the organisation worked when war broke out.

As soon as the 28th of September, the Toronto *Globe* gave out that a Canadian contingent would be sent to South Africa; it went as far as giving all the details of the recruiting and equipping of the volunteers. It was well known then, in Ottawa, that General Hutton and his staff were actively engaged in preparing for action. However, on the 28th of September, Lt. Col. PINAULT, Deputy Minister of Militia, wrote the following letter to Canadian officers who had offered their services:

In reply to your inquiry, I have the honor to state that the last news received from the War Office, London, is to the effect that the Imperial authorities are not recruiting for the army and are not preparing any expedition (of recruits) to Africa. Therefore, it would be fruitless to forward your application to England.

(*Globe*, September 29th, 1899.)

On the 28th, the Montreal *Star* had the following special cable from London:

Canada's proposal to tender a regiment for service in South Africa has awakened the keenest interest, which is accentuated to-day by the reports of Sir Charles Tupper's Halifax speech cordially supporting the idea.

I cannot learn, however, that any definite official offer has been received at the War Office, though a private letter has been received by Mr. Chamberlain from Sir Wilfrid Laurier, making tentative suggestions.

The project will undoubtedly do so much to again convince Englishmen of Canada's strong and practical Imperialism.

Hopes are expressed that Canada will not lessen the intrinsic value of the offer by calling upon the War Office, at this moment of extreme pressure, to arrange for transportation.

The object lesson of a united Empire would be greatly increased if each Colony would itself place its troops at the British disposal at the British base, Cape Town.

It is hard to bring into concurrence this announcement of the *Star* correspondent with the following declaration of the Prime Minister of Canada — unless the explanation should be found in the words: "private letter." Politicians and diplomatists, in all lands and all times, are apt to make fine distinctions between official opinions and private sentiment.

On the 3rd of October, Sir Wilfrid LAURIER made the following statement to the special correspondent of the Toronto *Globe,* in Ottawa; it was published the following day:

As I understand the Militia Act, and I may say that I have given it some study of late, our volunteers are enrolled to be used in the defence of the Dominion. They are Canadian troops, to be used to fight for Canada's defence.

The Prime Minister then explains that in a war where England would be fighting against a power whose navy could threaten Canada, the Government would be justified in sending Canadian soldiers abroad, without waiting for an actual attack upon our shores; and he adds:

The case of the South African Republic is not analogous. There is no menace to Canada, and, although we may be willing to contribute troops, I do not see how we can do so. Then, again, how could we do so without Parliament's granting us the money? We simply could not do anything. In other words, we should have to summon Parliament... And so it is that we have not offered a Canadian contingent to the Home authorities. The Militia Department duly transmitted individual offers to the Imperial Government, and the reply from the War Office, as published in Saturday's *Globe,* shows their attitude on the question. As to Canada's furnishing a contingent, the Government has not discussed the question for the reasons which I have stated — reasons which, I think, must easily be understood by every one who understands the constitutional law on the question.

On the 5th of October, Sir Charles TUPPER sent the following message to Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

Yarmouth, N. S., October 5th, 1899.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Ottawa:

I hope you will send a contingent of Canadian volunteers to aid England in the Transvaal. I know it will be warmly welcomed by the British government, be of great service to Canada and promote the unity of the Empire. A friend of mine will insure the lives and limbs at his own expense to a million dollars, and I will heartily support in Parliament your action in this matter.

CHARLES TUPPER.

(Montreal *Star,* October 17th, 1899.)

On the 3rd of October, the very day on which Sir Wilfrid Laurier stated that his Government had offered no troops and was debarred by the constitution from sending any, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, wired to Lord Minto an official despatch which began as follows:

Secretary of State for War and Commander-in-Chief desire to express high appreciation of signal exhibition of patriotic spirit of people of Canada shown by *offers to serve* in South Africa, and to furnish following information to assist organisation of *force offered* into units suitable for military requirements...

On the 13th of October, the Government gave way and decided to send a contingent. They then adopted the famous ORDER IN COUNCIL which contained the following paragraph:

The Prime Minister, in view of the well-known desire of a great many Canadians who are ready to take service under such conditions, is of opinion that the moderate expenditure which would thus be involved for the equipment and transportation of such volunteers may readily be undertaken by the Government of Canada without summoning Parliament, especially as such an expenditure under such circumstances cannot be regarded as a departure from the well-known principles of constitutional government and colonial practice, nor construed as a precedent for future action.

This is what was termed the " No-precedent Clause ".

A copy of this Order-in-Council was sent to Mr. Chamberlain, on the 20th of October, 1899. In his reply, dated November 15th, 1899, the Colonial Secretary said:

The desire thus exhibited to share in the risks and burdens of Empire has been welcomed, not only as a proof of the staunch loyalty of the Dominion, and of its sympathy with the policy pursued by Her Majesty's Government in South Africa, but also as an expression of that growing feeling of the unity and solidarity of the Empire which has marked the relations of the Mother country with the Colonies during recent years...

In other words, the sending of the contingent was welcomed for

the very oppositive motive to that expressed by the Canadian Government, namely, because it did mean a precedent.

The above documents are contained in the correspondence laid down in the British Parliament in November, 1899 (*Parliamentary Papers*, 1899, Cd. 18), and in the Canadian Parliament, in March, 1900.

I may give just here another striking illustration of the most extraordinary methods used by Mr. Chamberlain and of the weakness shown by our own rulers in their relations with the Colonial Secretary.

On the 4th of June 1900, I put the following question to the Government:

Has the Government, or any of its members, been consulted as to the conditions upon which the South African war should be settled? Is it the intention of the Government to offer any suggestion or opinion on the matter?

To which the Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid LAURIER, replied:

Neither the Government nor any of its members have been consulted as to conditions upon which the South African war should be settled. They are not considering the advisability of offering any suggestion or opinion upon the matter.

(*Debates,* House of Commons, 1900, Vol. II, page 6625.)

On the 7th of August following, Mr. FABER (M. P. for York) in the House of Commons of England, asked —

the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, considering the part taken by Canada and Australia in the South African war, it is proposed to ascertain the views of the Governments of those countries in regard to the settlement and government of the Transvaal and Orange State when the war is over?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I have already made myself acquainted with the views of the Colonies of Canada and Australasia in regard to the main points of the future settlement, and Her Majesty's Government are in complete accordance with them as to the necessity for annexation, the establishment of a Government supported by military force, with the ultimate expectation of an extension to both colonies of representative self-government. (Cheers.)

(P. D., Vol. 87, page 909.)

At the next session, I again brought the matter forward. On the 18th of February 1901, I put the following question:

1. Was the Canadian Government or any of its members consulted by the British Government on the South African question, since the first of June last?

2. Did the Canadian Government or any of its members offer any opinion or make any suggestion to the British Government on the matter?

The Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid LAURIER): The Canadian Government was not consulted, nor was any of its members, by the British Government on the South African question since June 1st last. No member of the Canadian Government offered any opinion on the matter.
(*Debates,* House of Commons, 1901, Vol. I, page 106.)

It is hardly possible to conceive a more direct and positive contradiction. Either Mr. Chamberlain consulted Canada or he did not. If he did, how could the Prime Minister of Canada state most emphatically, on two different occasions, that his Government had not been consulted? If he did not, why did the Canadian Government leave without protest this abuse of their name by the Colonial Secretary, in favour of his policy?

I need not give here, as I have done in the french edition of this pamphlet, all the declarations and expressions of opinion from Canadian statesmen, proving that they never attached any real importance to the reservation which they had themselves introduced in their Order-in-Council. As a matter of fact, friends and supporters of the Government, and even members of the Cabinet, when addressing English-speaking portions of the Canadian people always endeavoured to minimise the meaning of the " No precedent Clause." But in the Province of Quebec, it was pointed out to the people, and most strenously insisted upon, that the Government had taken proper care not to commit Canada to any future participation in British wars.

I will just give here a few extracts from speeches made at the time of the departure of the first contingent from Quebec.

On the 28th of October 1899, at a banquet at the Garrison Club, the Hon. F. W. BORDEN, Minister of Militia, said:

This marked an epoch, and a most important one, not only of the Militia, but of Canada, and of the Empire. The people of Canada have at last fully realised the debt they owe the Empire... The Empire is no longer a power with dependencies, but a power made up of several nations. The process of Empire building in this sense may have gone slowly, but now it has come. In the past, the main difficulty was to find a means of bringing about this step, but now it is developed, just as the great constitution under which the Empire is governed has been developed, just as Canada is now taking part in the wars of the Empire without any one being able to tell how it all came about...

Major General HUTTON said:

This is in its way a matter of satisfaction, but, gentlemen, what after all is the contribution of a thousand men to [the] requirements of a great Empire? This is numerically nothing; and what Canada has to look to, if she is to fulfil her role as a portion, and one of the greatest portions, of the great confederation of the Mother country and her Colonies, called the British Empire, is that the time may come when not 1,000 men, but 50,000 or

100,000 may be required to maintain the unity, the integrity, nay, the very existence of our Empire...

(Montreal *Star,* October 30th, 1899.)

The next day, at a dinner at the Citadel, the GOVERNOR GENERAL said that:

The contingent was the first present which Canada had given in the great Imperial cause. This was a new departure, and the future was filled with possibilities. The present expression of Imperial union was more expressive than a written constitution could be. The sending of these troops might raise the question of Imperial Federation, but he was not there to discuss that question. He had always been opposed to written constitutions; he would prefer to trust the feelings of the heart...

(Montreal *Star,* October 31st, 1899.)

At the general review of the troops, Lord MINTO had said:

Canada has freely made her offerings of this military contingent to the Old Country, and in so doing has accepted the difficulties which she knows must follow. The people of Canada have no desire to consider the quibbles of colonial responsibility. What they have done is to insist that their loyal offers should be made known, and they heartily rejoiced when they were graciously accepted.

(Montreal *Star,* October 30th, 1899.)

When came the session of 1900, the Government asked the House of Commons to ratify their unconstitutional expenditure of money used without previous authorisation from Parliament, for the equipping and sending of the two contingents. It then appeared to me that, if they were sincere when they stated in their Order-in-Council of October 13th that they entered into such an unprecedented action because it was not to be considered as a precedent, the Government could have no objection to a Parliamentary ratification of their declaration. I therefore made the following motion:

That this House insists on the principle of the sovereignty and the independence of Parliament as the basis of British institutions and the safeguard of the civil and political liberties of British citizens, and refuses consequently to consider the action of the Government in relation to the South African war as a precedent which should commit this country to any action in the future.

That this House further declares that it opposes any change in the political and military relations which exist at present between Canada and Great Britain unless such change is initiated by the sovereign will of Parliament and sanctioned by the people of Canada.

(*Debates,* House of Commons, 1900, Vol. I, page 1837.)

Both the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition united their efforts to smash up that motion, and forced the almost unanimous vote of Parliament to nullify the safeguards which had been offered to us in the Order-in-Council.

2o. Interpretation in England.

I will now give but a few of the declarations made in England by the leading statesmen of both parties. These will prove, I think, that the sending of our troops was not considered so much as an actual and effective help in the present war, but as the beginning of a new military organisation for the Empire.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE, SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR.

SPEECH AT SHEFFIELD, NOVEMBER 2ND 1899.

...Upon another incident in these operations —[referring to the war]— I feel bound to say a word — I mean the participation of our great colonies... It was with regret that we found ourselves obliged to impose limits upon the numbers which they were willing to furnish, but to my mind the value of this colonial force is not to be measured merely by their numerical strength in the fighting line. Its presence will impress upon the civilised world two great truths. — First, that "Greater Britain" is not an empty phrase, and, secondly, that we should not have obtained this large measure of voluntary support unless the cause for which we were fighting had been a just cause. (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 49.)

RT. HON. C. T. RITCHIE, M. P.

SPEECH AT LAUGHTON, ESSEX, NOVEMBER 8TH 1899

...Unhappy as was this war, it had had the effect of drawing more closely the bonds between the Mother country and her colonies, and it had shown that in times of danger and difficulty, when the interests of this country were imperilled, our fellow subjects in every colony would stand behind us. (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 80.)

MR. GEORGE WYNDHAM, UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR.

SPEECH AT DOVER, NOVEMBER 13TH, 1899.

...A source of Imperial strength has been revealed in its full proportions by this war, the strength and the magnitude of which none of us had suspected. That source of Imperial strength is the splendid spirit, the discipline, and the loyalty of our colonies... We have seen that proved to the full in South Africa. We have seen an earnest and a guarantee of it in the case of Canada and Australia... (E. P. H., Vol.I, page 111.)

RT. HON. SIR MICHAEL HICKS BEACH, CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.

SPEECH AT BRISTOL, NOVEMBER 13TH, 1899.

...But in connection with this campaign there would be remembered the way in which the great self-governing colonies at the other end of the globe

had come forward to assist the Mother country. As Captain Chaloner had well said, it would be the germ of a movement which, *conducted by wise and patient counsels,* should lead to the union of the Empire — a union which would give them cohesion and strength in any conflict in which they might be engaged with any other power. That was the great lesson to be learned from the war... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 108.)

RT. HON. JOS. CHAMBERLAIN, SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES.

SPEECH AT LEICESTER, NOVEMBER 29TH, 1899.

...Then again, we must rejoice — all of us — in the patriotism which has been exhibited by our great self-governing colonies in Canada and Australasia. Their contingents are now marching to the front; in fact the evening's telegrams show that some of them are already engaged. What a splendid reflection, that the Empire stands as one man against all its enemies! We value their assistance, *not so much for its material importance,* although we welcome it on that account; but much more because it is a demonstration opened to all the world of the essential unity of the British Empire. In the future, at any rate, let others, as well as our own citizens, know that no part of the Empire can be wrongfully used, that every other part will tingle in sympathy with it, every other part will bring its modicum of assistance. And is it not something more than that? — not only a testimony to the unity of the Empire, but a testimony to the justice of our cause. It is said that greed of gold is moving us in this matter, but how does it effect our liberty loving colonies in Australia and Canada? When we are forced to listen to the slanders of a foreign Press, we call to witness the voices and the affection of our Colonies in the self-governing countries... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 215.)

RT. HON. J. G. GOSCHEN, FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY.

Speech at the Headquarters of the First Middlesex Rifles, Berkeley Square, London, 18th December, 1899. After reviewing the history of the S. A. War, its disappointments and its causes, he said:

Another compensation which we have had has been in the attitude of our colonies, who have been seized with the Imperial idea, and who know that there is more at stake than simply the fortunes of the Mother country, and that every part of the Empire is deeply involved in the issue of this war, and from every part there comes the encouragement of offers of assistance and effectual help... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 298.)

RT. HON. A. J. BALFOUR, FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY.

SPEECH AT MANCHESTER, 8TH JANUARY 1900.

...I have been obliged to admit that the war has been in many respects up to the present time fraught with disappointments — disappointment of expectations formed by those most qualified by expert knowledge to decide. But do not let it be supposed that I, for one moment, suppose that the war, even as it is at the present moment, has not been fruitful in great deeds

and great blessings to this Empire... Think, again, of the thrill of sympathy which has gone from the Mother country, the heart of the Empire, to every one of its extremities, and has been returned, as it were, from the extremities, again to reinforce the heart of the Empire, from all our colonies, from all our dependencies, — from Canada, from Australia, from New Zealand — from India, from the great princes of India, our feudatories — all agreed upon a common object and moved by a common aim and prepared to make a common sacrifice. Is that nothing? I think it is everything... (E. P. H., Vol. I, pages 334-335.)

LORD KIMBERLEY, LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

SPEECH AT NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, NOVEMBER 14TH, 1899.

...Whatever might be the result of all this, there was one gain, which we could not be deprived of, viz., the fact that our colonies now regarded themselves as truly part of the Empire, and were willing when occasion arose to share the great burden of maintaining it... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 118.)

EARL OF ROSEBERY.

SPEECH AT BATH, OCTOBER 27TH, 1899.

After having appealed for union of all factions on the S. A. war, he said:

...I will give you another reason, because in this contest our world-empire has called to her assistance from every corner of her dominions detachments of her subjects, not to give her their assistance, for, thank God, we can do without that, but to show their sympathy, their resolution to be one with the Mother country in the hour of trial. How would Chatham have rejoiced to see that within a century and a half, that Empire which he had won for you was so consolidated as to send troops to the assistance of the Mother country!... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 24.)

SPEECH AT CHATHAM, JANUARY 23RD, 1900:

Having referred to the war and its reverses, he said:

There has been a great loss of prestige, and although the word "prestige" has not always been in good odour in this country, yet every thoughtful person must recognise that prestige is a token of Empire, and a very useful asset in the possession of an Empire. I suppose that at the end of 1898, the prestige of this country stood higher than it has stood since Waterloo. I am afraid that this war has dispersed a good deal of that sentiment, but I ask you to remember that if prestige was ill-founded it is infinitely better that it should be dispelled now than that, resting on a rotten foundation, it should lure us by its dream of power into enterprises which might be much more disastrous... I could say the test of the character of our people will alone counterbalance the losses we have undergone. But I say much more. We have a greater gain than that still to reckon up. Five and twenty

years ago we had an Empire in name. It was the fashion to consider it as something loosely compacted together, which at any moment might break up, and as to which it was only a calculation of time when the principal members of it might depart and set up for themselves. I remember those days well. I dare say some of you may remember them too. What, at any rate, this war has done, if it has done nothing else, is to prove that the Empire is a fact, that it is based on a rock, that it is as compact as that, and is not merely a small congeries of countries in the world. Australia, Canada, aye, and great parts of India have shown a spirit not inferior to that of the Mother country herself... I say, then, that if with all our reverses we had purchased only the fact that our Empire is a united Empire, and therefore henceforth a supreme factor in the balance of the world, *we should have made a profitable transaction out of the war so far as it has gone*... Great as is the task before us in the field at this moment, the task that remains for us after this war is completed is the greatest task that ever lay before a nation. You will have, when this war is over, to put your Empire on a business footing... I believe that is a task which will occupy this Government, and perhaps many Governments, before you will see your Empire as it should be. (E. P. H., Vol. I, pages 386-7-8-9.)

III

Persistency and nature of the Imperialistic Movement in Great Britain.

1o. General Elections, 1900.

It may be said, in a general way, that the last general elections, in England, were virtually a triumph for the Imperialistic idea. It would be useless to quote the numerous speeches of nearly all the Unionist candidates and several of the Liberal Imperialists, who made of the military unity of the Empire the main plank of their platform. I will just give an extract of some of the declarations made by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN who may properly be looked at as the Prophet and the head of that movement.

In his electoral address to his constituents of Birmingham West, dated September 21st 1900, Mr. Chamberlain said:

> The issue which, in common with the rest of the electors of the United Kingdom, you will be called upon to decide is the most important presented to the people of this country during the present generation. We have reached the final stage in a great war, which has involved a heavy sacrifice of life and treasure, but has been made illustrious by the heroism of the Imperial forces and the patriotism of all classes of the people of the Untied Kingdom, and has also enlisted, for the first time in the history of the Empire, the enthusiastic support of our kinsmen in all the self-governing colonies... (E. P. H., Vol. II, page 13.)

Through the whole campaign, Mr. Chamberlain delivered a great many addresses; and in each and everyone of them, he claimed as the best title to public favour for the Unionist Government, the fact that, thanks to the South Africa war, the Colonies had been brought to supply armed help to Great Britain.

I give here a paragraph from his speech at Coventry, on the 1st of October. It is one of his most eloquent and forcible efforts.

SPEECH AT COVENTRY, OCTOBER 1ST, 1900.

...Now, gentlemen, the Government which I represent is an Imperialist Government. For five years, during which we have been in office, we have had one guiding principle, one great object to attain, and that is to weld together all parts of the Empire, to make of them a united whole, to secure their affection, to inspire their confidence. It was that idea which may be said to have permeated the great ceremonial of the Jubilee of the Queen. It was that idea which has been present to our minds in the federation of Australia. It is with that object that we have done everything to appeal to our colonists to recognise their importance in this great Imperial system, to induce them to see and to know that we love them, that we believe in them, *and that we look to them for aid and support.* Now, have we not succeeded?... How came it that all these men, without distinction, were ready to offer their lives and their treasure in order to support the cause of the Empire? It was because they thought that this Government was reasserting the principles upon which this Empire has been founded, reasserting the principles which in *recent times seem to me to have been too much forgotten*, the principles which were in times past the principles of Pitt, of Canning, and of Palmerston. Those principles are based upon this, that as long as the British Empire endures, a British subject, whatever may be his colour, so long as he is engaged in his legitimate occupation, shall be maintained in all his rights by the whole force of that Empire. It is because we asserted that principle in South Africa that we have had this grand, this unanimous support from our colonists, because they have learned to believe at last that to belong to such an Empire is a privilege, an honour, and a protection. Now, I say that this new sense of pride in the British Empire is the work of Her Majesty's Government, and for that you are asked to reward us by turning out the Government and by disgracing the statesman who has been placed in a position of responsibility in carrying out these principles... New pride has been kindled in this great Empire. We know that if ever the motherland is in danger we shall not be isolated. These sister nations of ours, great to-day, but destined at no short distance of time to be still greater, have given of their best to help us in our time of need and trial. But, gentlemen, there is also another side to the question. We have to recognise that this spirit on the part of the colonists is one which we have to reciprocate. If they will do that for us, we must be ready to do it for them — and wherever the British race may be scattered, in whatever quarter of the globe they may be insulted, oppressed, or put upon, there we must go to their assistance. Now this is the work upon which we ask your verdict... If you are now false to the principles in accordance with which your Empire has grown great, and upon which it must always depend, if you are indifferent to the wishes of your colonists who have supported you in this war, then, gentlemen, you will lose your colonies and you will disgrace the Empire.. (E. P. H., Vol. II, pages 178-180 and 186.)

AT STOURBRIDGE, OCTOBER 9TH, 1900.

...But this is an Imperial issue, and every colonist and kinsman you have across the sea has almost an equal interest with yourselves in this election. I wish they had votes! There would not be a Little Englander or even a Liberal Imperialist in Parliament... I have spoken in this election with feeling, with earnestness, because I believe, in the bottom of my heart, that this is a crisis, not in the history of this country alone, but in the history of the Empire. This, gentlemen, is a creative time, it is the time when we can make or mar the Empire. (E. P. H., Vol. II, page 213.)

And the supreme appeal under the form of a *Message to the Nation*, sent to the Birmingham *Daily Mail* to be posted on the screen giving electoral results:

PATRIOTISM BEFORE POLITICS. MAY THE UNION BETWEEN THE COLONIES AND THE MOTHERLAND, NOW CEMENTED BY THEIR BLOOD, BE FOR EVER MAINTAINED. (E. P. H., Vol. II, page 216.)

I need not say that the question of granting to the Colonies reciprocal favours of any kind was never mentioned by Mr. Chamberlain in any of his numerous addresses.

2°. Opinion of Several Statesmen.

The speeches that I have quoted so far were all made either at the beginning of the war or during the electoral period — that is, at times where the passions of the people were aroused and could tell upon the thought and language of public men. The following quotations are all taken from declarations made either previous to or after the electoral campaign, and in occasions where there was no need of appealing to popular sentiment. Several of those expressions of opinion come from men who are, by their position or occupation, free from popular influence.

This Chapter contains but declarations made outside of Parliament. Parliamentary Debates are quoted in the two following chapters (IV and V).

On the 15th of March, 1900, the IMPERIAL FEDERATION (DEFENCE) Committee, addressed a memorial to Lord Salisbury on the subject of the military defence and organisation of the Empire. The following paragraph is contained therein:

From the foregoing it will appear that while, on the one hand, the colonies have well earned their right to recognition as full citizens of the Empire, on the other hand the assistance of eleven million people, *both in men and in money*, is most desirable in order to provide for its future security. Under the circumstances, and in view of the strong desire now being evinced by the British people for the better organisation of the Empire to which they belong, the Committee ventures to suggest to Her Majesty's Government that a Conference of representatives of the self-governing colonies of the Empire be summoned at an early date, to consider with Her Majesty's Ministers the best means of organising the resources of the Empire for its defence.

Among the suggestions made by the Committee are the following:

(a) That an Imperial Council be established, as proposed by Mr. Chamberlain in 1897, and as recommended to a former Government in 1893 by the Imperial Federation League.

(b) That an Imperial fund be established to which all moneys voted by the Parliaments of the self-governing countries for the general defence of the Empire, for such term of years as may be agreed upon, should be paid.
(c) That the administration of this fund should be vested in the Imperial Council.

On the 17th March, Lord SALISBURY replied through his secretary "That the observations of the Committee will receive the serious consideration of Her Majesty's Government."

On the 30th March, Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, acknowledging receipt of a copy of the Memorial, stated "that the whole subject of the defence of the Empire is, and for some time past has been, receiving the most serious consideration of Her Majesty's Government." (E. P. H., Vol. I, pages 496-7.)

LORD KIMBERLEY, LIBERAL LEADER IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Speech at a dinner of the National Liberal Club, in London, on the 21st February, 1900:

...I am an Imperialist. In what way? you will ask. Well, in this way — in the way I believe every true Englishman is an Imperialist — namely, that, having this great Empire, we desire that it should be knit as closely together as possible under the free institutions that prevail. We desire to uphold and preserve that Empire — every one of us — but the Imperialism which means that we desire to lay hands upon more and more territory in all parts of the world — that is not the Imperialism with which I sympathise. The true Imperialist feeling is the feeling that is promoted by the splendid example which the colonists have shown us during the present war... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 450.)

Speech at a dinner of the Eighty Club, in London, on the 3rd of April 1900:

...The sympathies and support of the colonies give a power to this Empire, which I hope will be exercised for peace, which it could never possess if it were restricted to these Islands, great and powerful as they may be. This is the feeling that has forced itself, not very fast, upon the English people, and though we see it now in an exaggerated form, yet it is founded upon true and sound principles... We must look at facts as they are, and though we do not seek to extend our territories, we shall remain Imperialistic in our desire to knit together still nearer our colonies... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 571.)

Speech at a dinner at the National Liberal Club in London, in honour of the Australian delegates, on the 2nd of May 1900.

...I look forward to the time when we shall be brought still closer together, and brought closer together, not merely by sentiment, but also by a feeling that it is for the advantage and safety of the whole Empire, including our colonies in every part, that we should have a union which will not be forced upon them, but will join us the closer when those extraordinary changes which await us take place, and when the very ends of the earth will be brought closer together... The time will come, in my belief, when

they will not only come forward to help us as they have done so magnificently in our difficulty in South Africa, but when it will be found that we shall be able to frame *some system of common defence* that will be of as great advantage to this country as I believe it will be to our colonies. (E. P. H., Vol. I, pages 644-5.)

SIR HENRY FOWLER, M. P.

Speech at a banquet to Service Volunteers for South Africa, at Wolverhampton, 16th February, 1900:

These independent, self-governing communities, have shown not merely by eloquent words or by enthusiastic cheers, but by spontaneously sending forth thousands of their sons to fight and to die for their fatherland — that our Empire is one and indivisible, and that if ever it should be in peril from stress or storm it can summon to its defence a vast army of men of every class and creed and clime, who are proud of their allegiance to the one flag and the one throne... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 447.)

Speech to his constituents at Wolverhampton, on the 19th of April, 1900.

...We have witnessed a oneness of feeling throughout the British Empire which indicates a new epoch in our Colonial relations. There was a time when some statesmen were in favour of the abandonment of the colonies and India. The inexorable logic of facts has proved too strong, and that school has had its day. Our determination is to maintain our colonies, and to link them to each and to us by even closer ties... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 607.) (1)

LORD SPENCER.

Speech at Edinburgh, 24th April, 1900.

...And now what did we want with regard to the colonies? We wanted to draw them closer and closer to ourselves. We wanted to give them full liberty of action to legislate for themselves as they desired, but, on the other hand, we reserved to ourselves the right to maintain certain principles which he considered essential for the Mother country, such as free trade, which had had such a wide effect on spreading the commerce of England, and her influence in every part of the globe. We desired to get the sons of the colonists to join the people of this country and help to officer and man our ships and regiments... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 628.)

LORD ROSEBERY.

Speech as President of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Edinburgh "Unity of the Empire Association," April 4th, 1900.

...I know that at this moment our Empire is regarded with great jealousy, and even with great dislike, throughout Europe. It is vain to shut your eyes to these things, and those who are cognisant of the spirit which inspires, not the governments, but the nations of large parts of Europe —

1) Cf Sir Henry Fowler's sentiments on colonial trade preference (page LXXXVIII).

of the great majority of the countries of Europe — must feel, without charges of panic or pessimism being brought against them, that our country cannot be too prepared for every emergency when it has so large an army tied up in South Africa... We had to be ready and be prepared. We have already borne great sacrifices for the Empire, but we are willing to bear greater still. We are ready to do all that in us lies to promote the unity of that Empire, and to strengthen that Empire, and we, in this Association shall watch, and foster, and encourage every symptom hopeful and encouraging, from any quarter, which may justify us in hoping that before long we may see the Empire united, not merely in sentiment, but in constitution and in fact... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 578.)

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER.

Speech at the Primrose dinner of the St. Michael's Ward Conservative Association at Bristol April 19th, 1900:

...There have been previous occasions, in the time of the Crimean war, and in the time of the Soudan expedition, when Canada and Australia have offered assistance to the Mother country; but those occasions were as nothing compared to the uprising all over our Indian and colonial Empire of the deepest and strongest sentiment of Imperial rather than local patriotism, and of a determination that, come what may, they would stand by and support the Empire. There have been many who have hoped for some kind of Imperial Federation. Well, that is a delightful dream; it may be more than a dream, but it is a matter in which, whatever we do, we must not attempt to force the pace... People are very apt to forget that our great colonies on the other side of the globe are in a very different geographical and social position from ourselves, as compared with the Swiss Cantons or the United States to each other, and I confess I do not anticipate, whatever the future may have in store, to see in my time anything like a system under which there would be even an attempt at a common fiscal system or legislation on domestic affairs for the whole British Empire by a Parliament sitting in London. I do not myself believe that that is within any reasonable possibility. But the idea that the progress of this war has done so much to put forward is undoubtedly that of a common organisation for Imperial defence, and we have in the loyal and generous action of our colonies an earnest of the time in which there may be some kind of common organisation among us, which may control Imperial policy as a whole, representatives of the colonies acting in concert with representatives of the Imperial Government, in which all of us may take our fair and adequate share in the responsibilities and defence of the Empire at large... (E. P. H., Vol. I, pages 612-613.)

On the 24th of October, 1900, Sir M. Hicks Beach was entertained at a banquet by the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce. Responding to the toast " The Chancellor of the Exchequer ", Sir Michael made one of the clearest and most interesting pronouncements on Imperialism which may have fallen from any British statesman. He said:

...We have all recognised with admiration the sacrifices which our colonies have made in sending to fight side by side with our men, men from Australia and Canada, in the cause of the Empire in South Africa. We all appreciate the way in which the blood of those who have suffered has weld-

ed the Empire together. But I do not know that even that movement, great and important as it has been, was more remarkable than the congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, which took place last summer in London (1). That was a meeting at which there were differences of opinion, sometimes fundamental differences, no doubt, as must be expected from men bred in different schools of political economy, and coming from all parts of the world, from countries with very different conditions from those of the country in which we live; but, nevertheless, there was a determination, if possible, to come to a common agreement — a desire to give and take, which was of the best and most hopeful augury. I do not think this the occasion on which to go into all these subjects, but there are two subjects which stand out prominently from the debates on that occasion, and on which I should like, if you will permit me, to say a few words. The first was a desire for a commercial union, a closer commercial union throughout the different parts of the Empire; the second was a greater organisation for the common defence of the Empire. Now, with regard to the first, naturally enough, there were great divergencies of opinion. The result of your discussions was somewhat indefinite, because the subject was approached by some from the protectionist point of view, and by others from the free trade point of view. Gentlemen, I wish to say, for myself, that I am convinced that it is impossible to approach this subject from a protectionist point of view. *I do not believe in* the idea of preferential duties in favour of our colonies as *compared with foreign countries on the imports of the United Kingdom.* I do not want to argue the question to-night. I think if I had to argue it I could show you that any such duties would be dangerous to the utmost degree to our foreign trade, which is essential to the prosperity of this country. But I may venture to say this much, that I entirely sympathise with a remark which I saw recently in the press attributed to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Prime Minister of Canada, when he said that in his opinion an Imperial Zollverein, though far distant in the future, was only possibly attainable with absolute free trade throughout the Empire. I am confident that this great question — and it is a great question — can only be approached and dealt with on the principle of free trade, and that any attempt to deal with it on any other principle is unkind and unfair to our colonists themselves, and is misleading them as to the possibility of public feeling in this country. To suppose that this country, after fifty years experience of what the freedom of taxation on imports of raw material and food means to us, will deliberately resort to the taxation of raw material and food from foreign countries, is to my mind an impossibility. I do not wish to argue the question further. I wish, as I have said, simply to state my own opinion that any person in our colonies or in this country who founds his views as to the future on the possibility of any solution of this question except on the basis of free trade, is founding his views on a foundation of sand, and I would not for the world have the responsibility of saying to our fellow-subjects that we can deal with it on any other basis than that of free trade. But, gentlemen, I now turn to the second question. It is the question of Imperial defence... (E. P. H., Vol. II, page 383.)

....

The Empire has increased under successive Governments, some of them by no means favourable to any increase at all. You cannot help expansion with an Empire such as our own, and that expansion no doubt necessitates greater expenditure. How is that to be borne? Well, I suppose every one will say by the Imperial Exchequer. Gentlemen, I am bound to say something on that subject. There is no Imperial Exchequer. I wish there was.

---

(1) See page CVII *et seq.*

But I know very well that nothing whatever will persuade (and rightly so) our great self-governing colonies to give up their power of self-taxation to any Assembly in which their votes might be dominated by the votes of the United Kingdom, and therefore the great bulk of this expenditure falls on the Exchequer of the United Kingdom. While an expanding Empire we ought to have a much more widely spread system of contribution to Imperial defence than that which we at present enjoy. I do not believe you will find a single colony that will object to that. The whole history of the South African campaign shows that they have come forward voluntarily to a man in a matter which at first, apparently, did not affect them, to place their men and means at the disposal of Her Majesty's Government for the safety of the Empire, and I am convinced-that our colonists in America, in Canada, and in Australia are much too proud to desire to impose on the Mother country anything more than she ought to fairly bear for Imperial defence. We have at the present moment a great feeling of enthusiasm on the part of Her Majesty's subjects throughout the world. For the present and future of the Empire, I desire to see that feeling utilised. I desire every politician in this country or in the colonies, and every man of business, to do his best to utilise and to systematise while they can that feeling of enthusiasm. There are great difficulties in the way, of course, because with the bearing of such contributions there must come some share of responsibility for foreign policy. But these questions require discussion and consideration by the representatives of the Imperial Government and the great self-governing colonies, whose views it is our duty to keep before us; and we shall not do our duty if, in the course of the coming years, we do not utilise the enthusiasm which the South African campaign has evoked to endeavour to go at least one step forward in the principle of the common defence of a common Empire. (Page 385.)

LORD SALISBURY.

Speech at a Banquet of the British Empire League, in London, April 30, 1900.

The service which the colonial contingents have rendered upon the field is splendid and unexampled, and yet to my mind it is exceeded by another service which they have rendered to us all — that they have drawn the whole Empire together...

It is a great event which this war and the devotion of the colonial troops has caused... We know that after what the colonies have done we are a much more important nation in the world than we were. Our character is in reality more respected, our wishes are more regarded...

Well, of course, the result of this strange growth of an Empire, which, I may say, has taken place before our eyes, has set people thinking whether they cannot help nature and Providence a bit, and push it further on by artificial contrivances. *I am speaking, of course, of military matters alone.* I do not wish to express an opinion upon any proposals that I have not seen. But speaking generally, I should be inclined to discountenance any assistance to anticipate the natural working of the circumstances in which we and the colonies find ourselves. They have worked with great efficiency. They have produced Imperial cooperation beyond all our hopes and beyond all our expectations.

If any of you ask to push forward in colonial legislation, I should implore you to wait. The concurrence of the world's causes — to use a more modern phrase — what I should prefer to call the causes of Providence, have brought together the parts of this Empire in a wonderful concurrence

— have given them a force which all the world can recognise, and which, if you will only allow it to grow by its own laws and according to the impulse of its own vitality, will undoubtedly exercise an influence over the character and the progress and the habits of the world such as has never been exercised by any Empire before. (E. P. H., Vol. I, pages 634-5-6.)

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE, LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL.

Speech at a meeting at Derby on the S. A. War, November 14th, 1899.

...While we must all feel and admit that war in any circumstances, and especially on so serious a scale as the present war, is a great evil and a great calamity, it may yet have its compensations and its mitigating conditions. This war has already brought about a closer union between ourselves and our Colonies and has revealed to us a source of strength and power for this Empire which was scarcely known to ourselves, and certainly was little known to the world in general... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 124.)

Speech at the Third Annual Meeting of the British Empire League, in London, 23rd July, 1900.

...During the last few months it might almost be said that the whole Empire has become a British Empire League, and every inhabitant of that Empire, whether within the limits of the United Kingdom or in our Colonies or our great dependencies, has become, unconciously, a member of the League... It is difficult to fix exactly the date at which this great wave began to gather and to roll forward on its onward course. It became conspicuous in 1897, when, in the Diamond Jubilee, representatives of all our Colonies gathered together here to do honour to our illustrious Sovereign on the completion of sixty years of Her reign. It was then that many of us discovered, almost for the first time, that our Colonies were not only vast territories offering unlimited facilities for immigration and for the employment of the industrial and commercial energies of our people, but that they were also already great and organised communities, enjoying political institutions similar to our own — communities already possessing their Ministries, their statesmen, in power and in opposition, their Parliaments; and at the same time we discovered that they were not only thus organised for the purposes of government in times of peace, but that they were also to a very considerable extent organised for the purposes of Imperial defence and, if necessary, of foreign war. We discovered at the same time that those great communities, highly organised, as I have said, were also animated by the same sentiment as those of our people at home of patriotic and Imperial devotion. The events of the present year have given a practical proof of the force and vitality of those feelings in the manner in which our Colonies have come forward to aid us in the struggle in which we have been so long, and are still unhappily, engaged in South Africa. The sacrifices and sufferings which that contest has entailed have not been without their compensations. We have, both we at home and our Colonies, learnt lessons from that war which will be remembered. Our Colonies have learnt that we, the British people and our Government, have entered upon that war and have conducted it for the defence of the interests of the British people, whose home is the world, and not only these small islands, and that we are prepared to defend those interests all over the world in the same way as we

are prepared to defend our own. We, again, have learnt that, if we are to fulfil the duties imposed upon us by our colonising instinct and our instincts of expansion, we must rely not only upon our own strength and our own right arm, but that we must put full confidence and trust in the loyal and ungrudging assistance which, we have learnt, will be offered to us by every colony of the British Empire... (E. P. H., Vol. I, pages 807-808.)

LORD BRASSEY.

On the 22nd September, 1900, a meeting of the Imperial Liberal Council was held at the Western Palace Hotel, when Lord Brassey delivered his presidential address. He said:

...But we have drawn near to the limit beyond which it would be rashness to advance. Extension of territory involves proportionate expenditure on naval and military preparations, borne without a murmur while the country prospers, but certain to be less popular if trade were dull and employment difficult to obtain. We can safely guard what we have got. The prudent statesman will hesitate to add to responsibilities already so vast. I speak not less strongly on this point because I have given a large part of my attention to questions of naval defence. In this connection the federation of the British Empire is an object of the first importance, and recent events have advanced it by a long stride. The Mother country and her daughter States, in one of which I have lately spent five happy years, have stood together as they never stood before. The time seems now to have come when a permanent machinery might be set up on the model of the Committee of the American Senate on Foreign Affairs. In the Privy Council or the House of Lords, representation might be given to all parts of the British Empire, and in the one or the other a Consultative Committee of Advice might be constituted, to which treaties could be submitted, and which should have a voice on the issues of peace or war. While looking to the colonies to take the initial steps in Imperial Federation, the subject may worthily engage the attention of the best men on both sides... (E. P. H., Vol. II, page 362.)

RT. HON. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN.

On the 24th of October, 1900, Mr. J. Chamberlain was the principal guest at a banquet of the Fishmongers' Company, in London, when he was presented with the honorary freedom of the Company. Responding to the toast of his health, proposed by Mr. R. B. Martin, M. P., Mr. Chamberlain said:

...What is perhaps the greatest feature of all in this eventful modern history, look at the action of the Colonies, the self-governing colonies, in the period of trouble and trial which came upon the motherland. What sympathy they have shown! How practically they have shown it! How universal has been the sentiment! I speak of the self-governing colonies because under the circumstances it was *their aid only that we could accept. For political reasons we were unable to accept the offers that crowded upon us from every dependency of the Queen*, and above all from the feudatory princes who own her benificent suzerainty in our great dependency of India. But confining myself to the self-governing colonies, what have they done

for us? At the first threat of war they hastened spontaneously — it was not our suggestion — it was their own good thought — they hastened spontaneously to offer their aid, and they have given us in this war of their best and their bravest. They have fought and some of them died to maintain the honour of the flag and the interests of the common Empire. They have done something more, they have given us their moral support — the moral support of great, free, independent nations, proud of their own liberty, and able to take an impartial and judicial view of the merits of the struggle in which we were engaged. I do not think that anything could have been more grateful to the people of this country, more useful in regard to our position with other nations, than the sight of the colonies of Great Britain, of the sons of Great Britain, hastening freely to give their support to the motherland in a cause which they themselves considered and believed to be just. Then, in view of all this, is it too much to say that in these last twelve months the Empire has been borne anew? The Empire now is undoubtedly not the Empire of England, but the Empire almost of the world — of all our possessions, of all our dependencies, and let it be borne in mind in future that we recognise in them absolute equality of right and position in all that we claim in regard to ourselves. I believe that this new feeling is a compensation for the war. In our trial our hands were stayed by our colonies, as the hands of Moses were stayed by Aaron and Hur, till victory waited upon our arms. Shall we ever forget, shall we ever be ungrateful, will any one ever again dare to say that the colonies are an encumbrance to the Empire which they have done so much to maintain and support? This is the new situation, this is the new Imperialism which has been so grossly misrepresented, but which is, nevertheless, so well understood, which has received the overwhelming support of the majority of this country without reference to ordinary party lines or division... (E. P. H., Vol. II, page 380.)

LORD WOLSELEY.

On the 1st of November, 1900, Lord Wolseley and Mr. Henry Chaplin were guests at the 277th annual "Feast of the Cuttlers' Company of Hallamshire".

Lord WOLSELEY, responding to the toast "The Land and Sea Forces of the Empire," said:

...In speaking of the Army, I cannot but feel what a very different thing the Army is at the present moment from what it was ten years ago, to which time I have referred. Then the Army only consisted, as I have said before, of the forces which we had in this country — the regular Army, the Yeomanry, the Militia, and the Volunteers. But look abroad and see of what it consists of at the present moment. What has been done in South Africa in regard to the military forces there? It was felt eight or nine or ten months ago that the force in South Africa was not sufficiently large. This idea became well established throughout the country, and what was the result? From the north and the south, from the east and the west, came in application from every colony for the privilege and honour of serving under the flag of Her Majesty the Queen. They volunteered their services, and not only volunteered their services, but the Colonies sent the men to South Africa, and I am sure that of all forces which went to South Africa none did better service than the contingents supplied by Canada, Australia,

New Zealand, and even by our smaller colonies. We have heard a great deal for the last ten, fifteen, or twenty years, regarding the federation of our Colonies. Well, war is a terrible thing, and no one knows how horrible it is except those people who have taken part in it, but it has its good side as well as its bad, and one of the great results, good results, which has been brought about by this war has been directly the federation of our Colonies. I think we might have passed Acts of Parliament, and the various Colonies throughout the world might also have passed acts of parliament, to bring about this Federation, which we have looked forward to for so many years, but I believe they would have fallen very flat, and would have done little in comparison to what has been done by the great feeling of comradeship which has been cemented by men fighting shoulder to shoulder, men coming from all parts of our dominions... (E. P. H., Vol. II, page 397.)

RIGHT HON. JAMES BRYCE.

On the 29th November, 1900, Mr. Bryce spoke at a dinner of the Ninety-Nine Club, at Leeds.

...I am not aware that any body in the Liberal party ever proposed that we should abandon any part of our immense dominions, or that we should slacken in any way the ties that bind us either to our colonies or to our own possessions. On the contrary, I believe that if any one can suggest a scheme by which our self-governing colonies can be brought into closer relationship, a better defined-relationship, with the Mother country, in which they can bear their share of the Imperial defences, and have also a share of consultation in Imperial matters — I believe the Liberal party would heartily welcome the proposal... (E. P. H., Vol. II, page 457.)

LORD AVEBURY.

Speech at the annual dinner of the Royal Colonial Institute, London, April 24, 1901:

...There never was a time when Mother country and colonies were more thoroughly in sympathy, more loyal to the Crown and the Empire. I hope the time may come though it cannot be hurried, when these warm feelings may find expression in some more definite Constitution for the Empire. We often hear of the Imperial Exchequer, Imperial funds, and the Imperial forces. As a matter of fact there are no such things. There is an Exchequer for Great Britain and Ireland, an Indian Exchequer, a Canadian Exchequer, and so on, but there is not an Imperial Exchequer. In South Africa we have supported our fellow-countrymen who were oppressed and defrauded, to defend two of our colonies which were attacked. This has cost us thousands of valuable lives, added many millions to our taxes, and over 130 millions to our debt. We may make such sacrifices cheerfully, because we felt it was our duty, but obviously we could not do so over and over again. No one can say what part of the Empire will next be attacked — where the next danger may arise. It is clear that the weight of responsibility for the Empire must eventually be borne by the Empire as a whole, and not by any part. The Colonies have loyally and cheerfully recognised the force of these considerations, and we on our side cordially recognise the material assistance, and perhaps even more the moral support, they have

given us at a time when the Foreign Press, with some few honourable exceptions, have so grossly misrepresented and maligned us. It will be for British statesmen in all parts of the Empire to devise some plan by which we can create Imperial funds and Imperial forces, and perhaps I may add an Imperial Council, to provide for the service, the necessities and the safety of the whole Empire... (E. P. H., Vol. II, page 593.)

LORD GOSCHEN, FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY.

Speech at the same dinner, April 24, 1901:

...A huge bill has been incurred in the maintenance of the unity of the Empire. The bill has been presented, and the demand has been made that it is to be paid. The cost is enormous. It has been placed before the country in the plainest and most unvarnished words. And it is well it should be so. It is well that the nation should realise what Empire costs. All classes are now summoned to realise it — to realise it under what, if I may give my personal opinion, is the equitable distribution of burdens which they are called upon to bear under the Budget as proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. All classes are to contribute to the cost of the Imperial interests. It is natural, at a time like this, we should speculate as to how the tax-payers in the United Kingdom are likely to be affected by the demands that have been made — made for the sake of united Empire...

...Our fellow-subjects in the Colonies will see the attitude which the tax-payers have shown in this respect. They will see the readiness with which these increased burdens are borne. I hope our Colonial fellow-subjects will take to heart the suggestion made by Lord Avebury to-night in regard to an Imperial Exchequer. I did not see, however, that there was an enthusiastic reception of the general idea that there should be such an Imperial Exchequer. The Colonies will see, at all events, that we in these Islands have not shrunk from lavishing our treasure on behalf of what is not simply a British interest but an Imperial interest, dear to all parts of the Empire... (E. P. H., vol. II, pages 593-594.)

3°. A Few Dissentient Voices.

The expressions of opinion against the Imperialistic movement in itself or in its connection with the South African war are much scarcer and less definite. I will, however, quote the few following extracts, which show quite clearly the sentiments of the most conspicuous opponents of the war amongst those that are called in the House of Commons "front-benchers".

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY.

Speaking at Manchester on the 15th of November, 1899, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, referring to a statement attributed to Sir Alfred Milner in which the Governor of Cape Colony was reported as saying: "I am determined to break the dominion of Afrikanderdom", said:

...The power of Afrikanderdom is British as well as Dutch, and the whole effort of a true statesman ought to be directed not to reduce and destroy it but to build up and develop it and make a nation by its means. If we are to coin barbarous words, I would say that if South Africa is to be saved to the Empire it will be saved by *Afrikanderdom* and never by *Downing-Streetery*. Just consider for a moment, as an illustration, the splendid spirit which prevails in Canada at this moment, the loyalty to this country, the unity of feeling among themselves, and imagine what it would have been if a few years ago, when the French Canadians were perhaps a little self-asserted, and our own kinsmen in that colony were perhaps a little impatient — I am trying to put it mildly, — if at that moment the Governor General had proclaimed that he regarded his mission to be to put down Canadaism?... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 135.)

Except that the design has not been "proclaimed," that is exactly the work which Lord Minto is endeavouring to perform just now; and in this he is well helped by the weakness or the complicity of both political parties.

Speaking of Rochdale on the 28th September, 1900, the Liberal Leader said:

Let us remember that if our Empire is to stand it will not be by military strength, at any rate it will not be by military strength alone, or by our bold defiance of the world. It will be by the prosperity and the loyalty of a happy, healthy, free and contended people...

There are a number of people who are called Jingoes, a certain number of others are called Little Englanders, but the great bulk of the people of this country are neither one nor the other. At all events, eighty or ninety per cent, I would say, of the Liberal party, which we know best, are reasonable and common sense men who want to maintain our Empire, who want to assert the interests and the rights of our Empire, who do not want to see any harm come to it from any quarter of the globe, but who, on the other hand, fully realise the tremendous responsibilities we already have, who do not wish unnecessarily to add to them, and above all who wish to do nothing that is offensive or aggressive towards any of our neighbours in the world. If we adhere to that policy I believe we can maintain this great Empire for many years and generations. Such an event as we have seen this year accomplished — the Federation of our possessions in the Southern Hemisphere — is a lesson to us that by leaving the people to have their own way, by giving them local self-government, by not interfering with them, by obeying their wishes, so far as we can, and at the same time by encouraging them by our example and by our advice where it is asked, we can build up a great, strong nation which will be of immense assistance to us in the development and maintenance of the Empire. But if we take any other course, if we undertake responsibilities that we are not ripe or fit for, we shall be undertaking a task that we cannot possibly do justice to, and in trying to do too much we shall fail to do anything... (E. P. H., Vol. II, pages 108-109.)

RIGHT HON. JAMES BRYCE.

Speech at Aberdeen on the 26th September, 1900:

...It has now become the fashion to assume that neither morality nor christianity has anything to do with international relations — that our only

objects are to be territory and trade, our only guide self-interest, and our only means force. But it ought to be an enlightened self-interest. Business is business, and this war is bad business. It is not only bad business, it is bad Imperialism. And why? Because it has made us hated all over the world — and no nation, least of all an Imperial nation, can afford to despise the opinion of the rest of the world — because it has shaken our hold on a vital part of our Empire, because it has left us worse off in South Africa than we were before and with far greater difficulties to confront... (E. P. H., Vol. II, page 86.)

RIGHT HON. JOHN MORLEY.

But the clearest expression of sentiment against Imperialism, to my mind, is the one which was given by Mr. Morley, the most faithful survivor of the great Liberal School. Speaking at a dinner given at Cambridge on the 19th of May 1900, in honour of the Australian delegates, Mr. Morley said:

We were told the other day by the Prime Minister that the Manchester School is dead... Let us suppose then that the Manchester School is as dead as they say. Let them defile the graves of its professors, and let them sink the names of Cobden and Bright in coffins of lead into the abyss of eternal oblivion, provided they leave us three principles in living and active operation: untaxed food and free-trade as the foundation of our fiscal policy; non-intervention in the affairs of the continent of Europe as the foundation of our foreign policy; and freedom and independence for our colonies as the foundation of our colonial policy... (E. P. H., Vol. I, page 706.)

When I compare these few though refreshing expressions of sound principle with the numerous boastings of the domineering school, — the more I am told that Bryce and Morley have no following nor influence in England, the more I say that it is time for us to look after the guarantees of our self-government.

Military Imperialism : Its progress.

The documents contained in this Chapter will show clearly, I think, the predominant, I may say, the exclusive idea which permeates British Imperialism. They prove the critical situation in which England is placed as far as her military organisation is concerned. It will be found also how British statesmen are constantly thinking of "utilising" and "tapping" colonial loyalty. This undertaking, as remarked by Mr. Wyndham, requires "any amount of diplomacy" (1). I did not go further back than the Jubilee year. It is worthy of notice that before that period, the idea of getting military help from the Colonies was very seldom—if ever—manifested in the debates of the British Parliament.

I have divided those documents into two classes, as indicated by their respective titles: ARMY and NAVY.

1°. Army.

SESSION OF 1897.

On the 4th of March, Captain PIRIE, M. P., asked the Under-Secretary of State for War —

...whether, having regard to the changes about to be made in the British Army, and to the fact that in many cases our territorial recruiting areas do not suffice for the demands made upon them by their territorial regiments, the Government will give serious consideration to a proposal to create regimental districts in the several greater Colonies of the Empire, especially, in view of the popular sentiment in favour of such a proposal recently exhibited in Canada, and in commemoration of the 60th anniversary of Her Majesty's reign?

Mr. BRODRICK: A proposal of the nature referred to in the question has been received from Canada and has been referred to the Canadian Government for an expression of their opinion upon it. Her Majesty's Government are fully alive to the desirability of encouraging such tendencies on the part of the Colonies, but it is obvious that any steps in this direction

(1) See page LXI.

must need very careful consideration before action is taken. (P. D., Vol. 46, page 1579.)

It was shown in the first chapter, in the report of the Jubilee Conference, that Mr. Chamberlain had proposed an exchange of troops between Great Britain and the Colonies. On the 30th of July 1897, the Montreal *Star* had the following telegraphic despatch from its London correspondent:

In Army circles the announcement made by Rt. Hon. W. Brodrick, Parliamentary Secretary to the War Office, that there should be an interchange of the troops of the Empire, and that some of the colonial battalions should do duty in England, the British Regulars taking their places in the Colonies, has created the greatest interest, and more details are eagerly looked for...

SESSION OF 1898.

On the 24th of February, Captain PIRIE, M. P., asked if the opinion of the Canadian Government had been ascertained on the question of establishing in Canada "a territorial recruiting area;" also if steps were taken to create "regimental districts in several greater Colonies of the Empire?"

Mr. BRODRICK: The opinion of the Canadian Government on this subject has not been communicated to Her Majesty's Government. I am not aware of any proposal to create regimental districts in any other colony. (P. D., Vol. 53, page 1521.)

I may note, in passing, a slight evidence of the pressure exercised by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN on the Canadian Government. On the 29th of July 1898, the Colonial Secretary, in reply to some question, explained that Mr. Du Bosc, late Spanish *chargé d'affaires* at Washington, had been expelled from Canada by Sir Wilfrid Laurier "by his —[Chamberlain's]— direction" (P. D., Vol. 63, page 437).

This act of complacency on the part of our Government does not seem to have been rewarded by any better treatment of Canada at the hands of the American authorities.

SESSION OF 1899.

On the 9th of February, Mr. HOGAN, M. P., asked:

...whether an interchange of Imperial and New South Wales troops has been decided upon, and whether a similar concession will be made to other self-governing colonies desirous of availing themselves of it?

The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. G. WYNDHAM): The Government of New South Wales has agreed to the principle of an interchange of troops, and the details of the scheme are now receiving careful

consideration. Similar exchanges are under discussion with the Governments of the chief self-governing colonies. (P. D., Vol. 66, page 323.)

On the 21st of the same month, a question was put, asking whether a decision as to the raising of a new battalion in Canada to take place of the 100th Regiment (Royal Canadians), had been delayed by British or Canadian authorities; also if recruiting for the British Army in general could not be done in Canada.

Mr. WINDHAM: ...The question of recruiting for the regular army in Canada is now under consideration... has been under consideration for some time.

Mr. ARNOLD FORSTER: Will the Hon. gentleman say whether the obstacles has arisen here or in Canada?

Mr. WYNDHAM: I am not prepared to call the due consideration of the question an obstacle either on the one side of the Atlantic or the other (P. D., Vol. 67, page 45-46.)

On the 27th of April, Mr. ARNOLD FORSTER put the following question:

I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been called to the statement contained in the report of Major General HUTTON to the Canadian Government to the effect that a proposal has been made by the Imperial Government that recruiting for the 100th Regiment (Royal Canadians) shall be opened to British subjects in the Dominion of Canada, and that complete arrangements for carrying this out have been prepared; whether this statement was made by authority of the War Office; what steps, if any, have actually been taken in the direction indicated; and whether the early withdrawal from Canada of the 100th Regiment (Royal Canadians) is taken with a view of recruiting the Regiment?

Mr. Powell WILLIAMS: The Secretary of State has not yet received Major Hutton's report, and the War Office has not authorised any such statement as that referred to in the question. We are in communication with the Dominion Government as to recruiting in Canada, but the arrangements, which I am glad to say are progressing satisfactorily, are not sufficiently advanced for any statement to be made... (P. D., Vol. 70, page 711.)

On the 2nd of May following, Mr. ARNOLD FORSTER asked:

I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the official report made to the Department of Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada by Major General HUTTON, commanding the Canadian Militia, and specially to the passage therein relating to recruiting for the Imperial service, in which he states that it has been proposed by the Imperial Government that recruiting for the Prince of Wales' (Leinster Regiment, Royal Canadians) shall be opened to British subjects in the Dominion of Canada, and that complete arrangements for carrying this out have been prepared, and will be published as soon as the final instructions and the requisite official form had been received; and

whether Major General Hutton is correctly informed, and whether this statement was made by him with the knowledge or under the authority of the Colonial Office?

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN):

I have seen the statement in Major General Hutton's report referred to in the question. A suggestion of the nature described in that statement had been the subject of discussion between Her Majesty's Government and the Canadian Government, and I presume that General Hutton made the statement in the belief that a decision had been arrived at, which was not the case. (P. D., Vol. 70, page 1120.)

On the 21st of July, as the House in Committee was discussing the Army Estimates, Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen) said:

When we are in such desperate straits as at present concerning our Army, it is our bounden duty to put forward what suggestions we can for improving matters... The Colonies are a field which is practically untouched. It is typical of the War Office that there is delay after delay, procrastination after procrastination, and not tangible or practical result as regards recruiting in the Colonies. For three years the question as regards Canada has been as far advanced as it is to-day... (P. D., Vol. 74, page 1639.)

Replying, Mr. WYNDHAM, Under Secretary of State for War, said:

The Hon. and gallant member did make a very important suggestion. He said that more should be done to *tap the Colonies*, and he almost denounced the Government for not having achieved more in the direction of entering into an understanding with Canada and the other Colonies. There again I would ask the Committee to use their imagination, and to conceive what an elaborate process it must be by which the Mother country, with vast accumulated wealth, could approach a new country, where there was no accumulated wealth, to explain to that colony that our Navy confers great benefits upon them, and then to ask the latter into some arrangement for defence. What does that mean? It means that that colony has to adjust the new civilisation to the old, which must always be difficult. *Any amount of diplomacy is necessary*, for the thing must be put on its proper basis, which is that if any colony exhibits a great wish to take some portion of the burden of Empire, the Mother country should, as far as possible, modify its arrangements to meet the wishes of the colony. To go further than that would be folly, and to go even so far is a matter of *infinite correspondence and negotiations. We have been in communication with Canada* and at this present moment we have arrived at the stage of having drawn up certain proposals which I hope we shall to-day or to-morrow transmit to Canada to invite their opinion upon. Clearly it would be impossible for me to indicate the nature of the proposals, but I can assure the Hon. member that there has been no slackness on our side, no want of appreciation of the aspirations to take some portion of the burden of Empire which have been put forward by Canada... (P. D., Vol. 74, page 1643.)

SESSION OF 1900.

On the 12th of February, the House of Lords was discussing the military measures to be taken for and on account of the South African war.

The Marquess of LANSDOWNE, Secretary, of State for War, admitted that "the Militia is now 30,000 below its establishment." (P. D., Vol. 78, page 1177). He indicated at length the means that were to be taken in order to increase the forces, and he added:

We also intend to offer commissions to the Colonies, from whom we have already received many excellent officers, and I am sure any one who knows, as I know, anything about the Military College at Kingston, Canada, will not doubt that officers taken from that source are worthy to take their place by the side of the very best officers of our Army. (Page 1180.)

On the 15th, Lord ROSEBERY took part in the debate; he said:

You are known, on the confession of your own Minister, to be denuded of troops at home. You are sending every available man and gun that you can spare to South Africa. What is the amicable disposition of foreign nations on which you can reckon, so that we shall be left uninterrupted to pursue this war? I know there is nothing so unpopular, nothing so distasteful to the British public, and yet nothing so salutary, as to remind them of the opinion of foreign countries. But whether pleasant and salutary or not, in the crisis in which we are placed it is absolutely necessary to take notice of it... I confess I watch the situation in Europe and elsewhere more closely than I watch the situation in South Africa...

The speaker then alluded to the coldness with which Germany and United States had received the "public overtures" made to them by the British Government "for an alliance;" he spoke of the anti-British feelings of the French people, in spite of the conciliatory attitude of their Government, and of the points of friction with Russia; and he added:

"When you see a want of amity on the part of foreign Powers,... I say it may be given to any of us, however light-hearted we may be, to pause and to ask the Government to take a large grasp of the situation and to make proposals to the country which are adequate to that situation." (P. D., Vol. 79, page 30-31.)

Lord LAMINGTON said:

The Secretary of State for War... referred to the intention of giving commissions to colonial officers. I would ask whether something more could not be done. There was a proposal some time ago to have an interchange of Regiments between this country and the colonies... I think that after what we have seen of the work of the colonial forces, and what they are capable of doing, the present is an opportune moment to endeavour to bring into closer touch with one another the component forces of the different parts of the Empire...

Having referred to the new federation of the Australian colonies, he added:

It is of good augury that synchronous with a political movement that will enlarge her aspirations and add to her defensive strength, Australia, peopled by those of our own blood, should give us of that blood freely and voluntarily. This two fold event can but strengthen the ties which bind our Empire. And it would be a further aid in this direction were the Government to mark their appreciation of the services of the colonists by endeavouring to bring them into closer touch with the Imperial army, when revising our military system, and this without injuring local action or initiative. (P. D., Vol. 79, page 35-36.)

On the 19th of February, Mr. DRAGE (Derby) asked, in the House of Commons:

I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for war whether, in view of the services rendered by the Colonies in the present war, he will consider the desirability of consulting the Colonial Governments before proposing any scheme for the permanent reorganisation of the forces of the Empire; and whether, in view of the approaching visit of representatives of the Australian colonies, he will suggest to the Secretary of State the desirability of obtaining their views on the subject.

The Under Secretary of State for War (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Yes, sir, I have already said that we propose to await and, if need be, to invite, an expression of opinion from colonial Governments on that and kindred questions. The representatives have been sent over with a special object, but their presence may give us opportunities of informally discussing the question which the Hon. member has raised. (P. D., Vol. 79, page 364.)

On the 22nd of February, being asked as to the provisions of the Militia Laws of the self-governing Colonies, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said:

In Canada the Militia roll includes all male inhabitants between eighteen and sixty, who are British subjects and not specially exempted. The Militia may be called out for active service either within or without Canada... (P. D., Vol. 79, page 797.)

It is rather interesting to compare this opinion with that expressed by Sir Wilfrid LAURIER in his interview to the Toronto *Globe*, on the 3rd of October 1899, when the Prime Minister explained why the Canadian Government could not send troops to South Africa. Sir Wilfrid had then said:

...Our volunteers are enrolled to be used in the defence of the Dominion. They are Canadian troops to be used to fight for Canada's defence.(1)

---

(1) See page XXXIV.

On the 3rd of April, General LAURIE, M.P., (formerly a member of the Canadian Parliament) put the following question:

I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can inform the House whether the offers of 110 commissions in the Army to the Australian Colonies and 44 to the Dominion of Canada are intended as a recognition of the services rendered to the Empire in South Africa by the Australasian and Canadian troops; and whether it is intended to increase the number of commissions to be offered to Canada so that the people of the Dominion may be afforded, in proportion to population, the same opportunity of rendering military service to the Empire as is to be afforded to their fellow subjects in Australasia?

Mr. WYNDHAM: The numbers of commissions are approximatively as stated in the question. If all the commissions offered to Canada are filled, the Secretary of State will be quite ready to consider a further offer. (P. D., Vol. 81, page 1057.)

On the 3rd of July, Mr. DRAGE asked:

I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether any attempt has been made to ascertain the views of the Colonial and Indian Governments on the reorganisation of the military forces of the Empire; and whether the Government will consider the desirability of adding to the Committee of the Council of Defence representatives of the great self-governing colonies and of India.

Mr. A.-J. BALFOUR: I understand that opportunity has been taken to consult the authorities on the question referred to by my Hon. friend. The Committee referred to in the question is a committee of the Cabinet, and the Government, therefore, cannot add to it in the manner suggested. (P. D., Vol. 85, page 405.)

On the 19th of July 1900, lord BRASSEY (Ex-Governor of Victoria) brought before the House of Lords the question of the reserve forces of Australia. He said:

...I strongly urge that Her Majesty's Government should concert measures with the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia with a view to raising an Imperial Yeomanry in Australia of at least 5,000 men, under engagement to serve in any part of the Empire, the cost to be met by *joint contributions* from the Imperial Exchequer and from Colonial funds... (P. D., Vol. 86, page 437.)

SESSION OF 1900-1901.

On the 11th December, 1900, Sir Chas. DILKE asked:

I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether Mr. Seddon's scheme for the erection in the self-governing colonies, by British financial assistance, of an Imperial military reserve has had its consideration; and whether the scheme, as modified in its financial proposals by a joint committee of the two Houses of the New Zealand legislature, has yet been submitted to him?

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. HICKS BEACH): I have not, personally, had the scheme brought to my notice, but I am aware that it is under the consideration of the Government. (P. D., Vol. 88, page 501.)

On the 8th of March 1901, Mr. BRODRICK, the new Secretary of State for War, brought before the House the Army Estimates. He made an exhaustive review of the military position of Great Britain, showing the heavy strain caused by the South African war, and the imperative need of complete reform and of a large increase in the forces of the Empire. The whole speech should be read. I quote the following extracts:

In approaching the subject of reform, I would ask the House to allow me to mention two points on which we differ from any other nation in regard to the problems we have to face. In the first place, we have got to keep an enormous force abroad, quite apart from war, in a time of peace. We have got to provide, to equip, 115,000 men in India and the Colonies, mostly in tropical stations, and we have to attempt to do that, which no other power attempts, relying entirely upon voluntary enlistment...

...Is our army in future for home defence to be a voluntary army, or is it to be recruited by compulsion?... I know very well how easy it is in this House to win cheap cheers by a proud declaration about adhesion to the voluntary system. I think the voluntary system for home defence is not a thing to be proud of, unless you get an efficient defence... Therefore my adhesion to the voluntary system is strictly limited by our ability to obtain under it a force with which our military authorities can satisfy the Government that they have sufficient force to resist invasion and can maintain to their satisfaction. At the same time the Government fully recognise that, while the country is willing to pay heavily to escape invasion, it is incumbent on the Government to exhaust every means before coming forward with any such proposals, and especially under the circumstances of the present time.

We have never had such recruiting as we had last year under the influence of the warlike spirit that pervaded the country and the conviction that the war was just and necessary... I do not believe that this great spirit of recruiting will continue with the same intensity after the war is over. I am not at all certain that the ease with which money is obtained now will be borne out by the pleasure with which the taxation necessary for it will be paid... I am attacked for parsimony, I think the day is not far distant when I shall be attacked for extravagance;... and I even think, as I pass the lamppost in Palace Yard, there will be plenty of people who would be glad to hold on to one end of a rope if they could only be persuaded that I myself or the Chancellor of the Exchequer was attached to the other end.

...I will not entertain the question of a European war, but I think no man in the House will be so bold as to say that under all circumstances we shall be able to keep ourselves free from European entanglements... We cannot shut out the possibility of having to send a large force to defend our own possessions, nor can we suppose that if ever we should become unhappily entangled in a European war we can limit our enterprise solely to the defence of our possessions, and to the action of our fleet... (P. D., Vol. 90, pages 1058 to 1063.)

The Militia should be 150,000 strong, but it is only 100,000 strong. There is something worse than that:... As a matter of fact we have to take and

train about 30,000 each year, and we only produce 100,000 of a total force on the six years' engagement. The reason is very simple. The inducements we offer the men are not sufficient to keep them. (Page 1071.)

Now, we intend to put our money on the Yeomanry, and we expect great results... The pay will be 5 s. a day, with ration allowance and forage... I trust the day is not far distant when some of our colonial brethren who have given us mounted assistance during this war will be willing, *subject to the consent of their own Government*, to keep up mounted contingents, also under the title of Imperial Yeomanry who, when occasion demands, will be available to join our own Yeomanry should they ever volunteer to go abroad. (Pages 1074-5-6.)

On the 14th of March, Sir Chas. DILKE spoke on the same question; he said:

...It had been almost universally accepted after the experience we have had of colonial mounted infantry in this war that there would be some sketch, however faint, of the future constitution of an Imperial mounted infantry throughout the Empire. I know it is said that these suggestions should come from the colonies, but they have come. You would not be forcing any such scheme on the colonies, but you would only be accepting an invitation already made. Suggestions have been already made by Canada and Australia, and in New Zealand a definite scheme has been proposed by the Government, and the country will be disappointed that no reference has been made to that scheme by the Secretary of War.

Mr. BRODRICK: I made a distinct reference to it.

Sir Chas. DILKE: The point on which reformers in this House have always insisted, and the necessity for which has been terribly shown in the early stages of this war, is that we should not wait for war to make these preparations, but that an arrangement with the colonies should be made in time of profound peace so that it might be in working order when war broke out, and not have to be made much too late to render all the assistance it would have rendered in the earlier stages of a war. (P. D., Vol. 90, page 1665.)

On the 15th of March, during the same debate, Mr. Arthur LEE (Hampsire) said:

In regard to the raising of the Imperial Yeomanry, I must express deep regret that the question of the cooperative defence of the Empire has not been brought forward in some shape in this connection. It may be said that the time is not ripe. I think the time is peculiarly ripe. I have lived for some years in the Colonies and am still in touch with colonial opinion, and my belief is, whatever the governments of the Colonies may be saying, that the people are only too ready to take part in any scheme of cooperative defence of the Empire, if you will give them the opportunity. *The governments are waiting to see which way the cat will jump*, and I believe that any well considered proposal would meet with a most enthusiastic response. Failing such a proposal, I wish the Right Hon. gentleman had been able to suggest a scheme by which each of the Colonies concerned would have accepted *a fixed share*, however small, in the Imperial offensive army... (P. D., Vol. 91, page 147.)

Mr. Edmund ROBERTSON (Late Civil Lord of the Admiralty, 1892-95):

The Colonies are either self-governing or they are Crown Colonies. If they are Crown Colonies then we have the power and the right to make them pay for a portion of the burden of Imperial defence. If the self-governing Colonies count for anything in this additional expenditure proposed by His Majesty's Government, then I say those colonies ought to contribute to that expenditure... When the time comes for the settlement of the debt for the war in South Africa — which is an Imperial war for colonial defence — are you going to ride off on the clap trap that certain colonies who have gone to the front indulge in? Is that to be the answer in regard to what ought to be demanded from the colonists for their share of this imperial war? If the colonists pay their share of the burden of this war they ought to pay at least one third of the whole cost, which has fallen upon this country. (Page 174.)

On the 14th of May, the House discussed a motion of the Secretary for War in favour of a new organisation for the Army. Lord STANLEY, Financial Secretary to the War Office, said:

...Complaint has also been made that the Colonies have not been included in the Imperial Yeomanry. But the Government intend to bring forward a scheme to establish in the Colonies a force composed of the same class of men, under the same rules and regulations, and fighting, if necessary, in the time to come under the same flag, *under the same name*, which a portion of them have certainly helped to make historic... (P. D., Vol. 94, page 92.)

Mr. Freeman THOMAS (Hastings):

I entirely agree with the Right Hon. Baronet, the member for the Forest of Dean (Sir Chas. Dilke), in the suggestion he throws out, and to which I was glad to hear the noble Lord give a most friendly assent, in regard to the Imperial Yeomanry in the Colonies. I believe that in regard to these Yeomanry it would be a graceful action on our part, having regard to past events, if we followed the suggestion which has been made. I believe such action would be received with enthusiasm in the colonies, and I am bound to say they would make a body of men second to none for the defence of the Empire... (Page 106.)

On the 15th of May, during the same debate, Col. BROOKFIELD, M. P., whose argument was that Mr. Brodrick's plan of reorganisation was totally inadequate, said:

...It is hoped... that this Imperial system will in time include colonial troops as well. I don't see why they are excluded at the present moment... It could be done by pressing into service all those colonial troops whom he is candid enough to say he only intends to ask in an incidental way. (P. D., Vol. 94, page 353.)

On the 20th of May,

Col. LEGGE:... asked the Secretary for War whether he would consider the advisability of inviting the Colonies to raise regular corps for service in the Imperial Army at home and abroad both in peace and war?

Mr. BRODRICK: The proposal has been repeatedly considered, but has not hitherto been found practicable. I hope a beginning of such a connection may be made through the Imperial Yeomanry. (P. D., Vol. 94, page 583.)

We have now the origin of the third Canadian contingent. People whose proud feelings were aroused by the title of Yeomanry may now see why this name was adopted. The British authorities have sacrificed the *name*; but they have the *fact*: they have succeeded in establishing in the colonies a system for "raising regular corps for service in the Imperial Army." It was a similar attempt that was denounced by the *Canadian Military Gazette* in January and February of last year.

The sending of this late contingent is therefore more serious, when looked at from the view-point of our future, than the two first expeditions: it is the inauguration of a new military policy which the British Government had never contemplated in past years, even when we were but a Crown colony. That the consent of the Canadian Cabinet was sought for and considered as an essential condition of the bargain, is clearly shown in Mr. Brodrick's above quoted speech on the 8th of March last (1).

This fresh encroachment upon our constitutional liberties has been made without any previous consultation of the will of parliaemnt. And this time, popular pressure cannot be invoked as an excuse. It is claimed we pay nothing. The question of cost is a mere side-issue: what is at stake is the self-government and the national dignity of our country.

I do not insist on the moral responsability which Canada has assumed in sharing in this odious war;—a war in which incendiarism and executions have become the favourite weapons; a war that causes the conscience of the whole civilised world to revolt; a war which makes the best and the noblest of Englishmen shiver with horror and shame.

Many a times I was asked in London: "How is it that you Canadians are helping the Tories with arms, money and argument, in order to impose by brutal force in South Africa the very principles against which you struggled for fifty years and from which you were freed by us, British Liberals?"

---

(1) "....*Subject to the consent of their own government.*.." (Page LXVI.)

I had the advantage of following a part of the debate raised in the House of Lords, last summer, by the Duke of Bedford on the reform of the Army. No one who listened to the able speech delivered on that occasion by Lord Wolseley, could help but being struck with the distress in which the British Army is now placed.

In his remarks, on the 25th of June, the Duke of BEDFORD said:

I am calling attention to proposals presumably the outcome of our recent experience of actual warfare... Yet the proposals of the government ignore the three principal lessons of the war. There are no attempts to create a real Reserve... There are no efforts to provide a body of 30,000 men who can be embarked at a day's notice without recalling men from civilian life to take the place of boys serving with the colours, thus disorganising every unit on the eve of embarkation. There are no indications of any determination on the part of the Government to found, on the reorganisation of our military system and on the patriotic devotion of our colonies, a well-considered scheme of Imperial defence. (P. D., Vol. 95, page 1350-51.)

He them makes an argument against the system of conscription — and he ends his speech by moving the following proposition:

That, in the opinion of this House, the terms now offered to recruits are not sufficient to fulfil the requirements involved in the proposals for the reorganisation of the military forces. (Page 1370.)

On the 28th of June, in the course of the same debate, Lord HAMPDEN (Late Governor of New South Wales, 1895-1899) speaking of the plans suggested by the War Secretary (Mr. Brodrick) for the organisation of the Yeomanry, said:

...I should like to allude to the action of Australia. I do not mean to refer to the magnificent services and sacrifices which Australia has made in this war... what I wish to refer to is the possible cooperation between the great self-governing colonies and the British Government in maintaining a force of mounted infantry which may be employed within the limits of the Empire... (P. D., Vol. 96, page 213.)

The Marquess of LANSDOWNE, late Secretary for War and now Secretary for Foreign Affairs, replying to the remarks made by the Duke of Bedford on the 25th, said:

That the noble Duke should blame us because we have not in a few months at our disposal brought forward a comprehensive scheme of colonial defence appears to me to be the climax of unreasonableness. Any scheme designed for Imperial defence on a large scale implies cooperation between British and colonial forces, and requires most careful and delicate preparation; and to my mind the idea of attempting to rush any scheme of the kind through the Parliaments of this country and the colonies within a few months is absolutely preposterous... (Page 219.)

He then pointed out the danger of increasing the war estimates.

I may add, in passing, that Lord Lansdowne does not realise the progress made by our parliament, in the way of subserviency, since he was Governor of Canada.

Lord WOLSELEY said:

...Of the many important lessons we have learned from this war one of the most important, in my opinion, is that our army is altogether too small. There are only two means by which we can obtain an adequate Army for our purpose. The first is by compulsory service, and as to that I do not think myself that the time has yet arrived for it, that the people's minds are yet sufficiently accustomed to the idea of conscription; and the second is the simple process of pounds, shillings, and pence... You advertise for men, but you get only boys. They say they are eighteen; but we know perfectly well that a large number of them are under eighteen, and if they pass the medical examination and the requirements as regards height and chest measurement they are accepted. But supposing a recruit is eighteen, he will not be a thoroughly good soldier until he has had three years service... The number of men that will have to be discharged at the end of the war will be very large. I believe you will require the year after the war from 80,000 to 100,000, and the idea that you can get this large number of men by the proposals stated by the Secretary for War in his able and admirable speech is the idea of a visionary and not of a practical man... (Pages 235-6-7.)

Lord TWEEDMOUTH:

I do not advocate any very large increase of pay to our soldiers, and I fully recognise all that has been said by the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs as to the danger of swelling our already gigantic estimates. (Page 242.)

A few days later, speaking at the Royal United Service Institution, Lord WOLSELEY said that:

The first question we had to answer was — What was to be the strength of our Army?... How we were to get an army resolved itself in his mind into a very simple problem, and that was that every man in England must offer himself or else pay some one else to serve for him. We must raise an army, and if we could not get it for 1 shilling we must get it for 2 shillings...

(*Times*, July 8th, 1901.)

Taking together the arguments of Lord Wolseley and Lord Tweedmouth, which are quite expressive of the general feelings in England just now, one must come to this conclusion: England needs soldiers; she can get but children at home to fill the ranks unless she increases largely the pay, and even then it is not quite sure that she will get the required number of proper recruits. On the other hand, conscription is hateful to the people, and the burden of taxation has almost reached the limit of possible endurance. Is it

not natural therefore that the British military and political authorities should look for help from those colonies which they despised so long, to which they find it impossible to grant the slightest commercial advantage, but from which they hope to get cheap and efficient material for their army and navy? And indeed nearly all the official representatives of the Colonies, when in London, never fail to assure their beloved English masters that they can speculate at leisure upon colonial devotion.

I could have multiplied quotations from military authorities to prove how badly they want recruits from the Colonies to take the place of the United Kingdom citizens who find it more convenient to let their dear colonial kinsmen fulfil the duties which they do not care to assume themselves. I will just give this extract of an article on "The Army of India", written by Major General Sir Edwin COLLEN, late military member of the Council of the Governor General of India, in the *Empire Review* of December last:

> There can be little doubt that every one, civilian or soldier, who thinks at all about the matter, would look with favour upon a plan of Imperial defence to embrace a Navy with sea-power sufficient to cope with possible combinations, an adequate home defence, and the ability to take the field in such strength as our responsibilities require, supplemented by military forces, organised beforehand, from the other parts of the Empire, with due provision for local defence. Call them by what name we may, regulars or permanent troops, militia, yeomanry, or volunteers, we must have soldiers to take the field in large numbers and well organised, to defend England, the countries in which she has a stake, and every outpost of the Empire.
>
> This is the problem which has to be solved, and although opinions may differ as to the number of men we ought to have, the means by which we should obtain them, and the organisation into which they should be formed, few will be found to disagree very seriously with this general statement of the question. But at once, and in the very forefront of our difficulties there rises up the solid obstacle of ignorance. How can we be brought to appreciate the conditions of every part of the Empire? The only possible way is to try and spread the knowledge of those conditions. It is imperative that education, whether for high or low, shall in the future teach a far wider acquaintance than it does at present with the history, geography, and characteristics, of the components parts of the Empire, and that those who hope to lead and govern shall have an intelligent appreciation of the naval and military organisation, and resources, of the whole...

2°. Navy.

DISTRESS OF THE BRITISH NAVY.

In February 1897, Lord Charles BERESFORD published, in *The Nineteenth Century*, an article entitled: *"Urgent questions for the Council of defence"*, which created quite a sensation. Referring to the Report of the "Hartington Commission", of 1890, Lord Beresford then said:

It is six years since this Report was printed, but I contend... that the same dangerous and inefficient state of things exists to-day, and this can be conclusively proved. The whole of the Report teems with facts so monstrous, and reveals a state of affairs so shocking, that in any other country in the world there would have been a complete reorganisation of the "system"...

Logically, the first question to be dealt with is the *personnel*. The country may build many fleets and squadrons but they are useless for winning actions without the human element in the shape of officers and men to man them...

It is absolutely ridiculous to call the present 25,000 R. N. R. men a reserve at all. They are excellent material, but they are of no use. First, because few of them would be available in war time, and secondly because they are untrained and undisciplined. Very few of them have ever seen a gun fired afloat. A large proportion of them take their 28 days' drill spread a week at a time over the year. Each time they have to start afresh. The "twenty-eight days" is in itself a farce...

On looking at that Return it will be found that in the British Navy there are included vessels (put down as fighting ships) which it would be criminal to send to sea to fight an action. There are *forty-five* vessels in the British list in that return which are still armed with muzzle-loading guns. Not one *single* vessel in the Return of any other European nation has a muzzle-loading gun on board...

It must not be supposed that only the ships with muzzle-loading guns are worthless. There are others in the British Navy that are armed with breech-loading guns and yet are worthless as fighting ships. All the "C" class of cruisers, for instance. A list could be made out of eighty or ninety of such ships utterly unfit to be kept in commission or reserve as "fighting ships."...

...I have been charged with saying unjustly that the Admiralty is not run on businesslike principles. What firm would keep obsolete plant and machinery on its premises? What railway would keep George Stephenson's "Rocket" in reserve to supply the place of a modern express engine should the latter break down?...

...When I had a seat in the House, I brought forward a motion that one of the unarmoured ended battleships should be thoroughly tried by perforating its ends, and placing it in the same position as it would probably occupy in an action. This motion I was asked by a member of the Cabinet not to press, the argument he used being, "Suppose your theory is correct, do you think it would be to the advantage of England to show other nations that thirteen out of twenty-two of her first class battleships are inferior to those of France, and that they can be made dangerous from small gun-fire?" The Right Hon. gentleman quite forgot that it would be still worse for other nations to discover this when the thirteen ships in question went to the bottom in war time by turning turtle with their crews...

It would be possible to continue a list of startling and serious facts about our administration and its want of method, so as to fill up more than one number of this Review, but it would not be wise to reveal too many of our weaknesses at once. Foreign Powers know them. The British tax-payer is the only person who does not. Of course Their Lordships at Whitehall know all these facts, but under the "system" they are not supposed to do anything...

If ever war comes and finds us unprepared, it will bring with it a terrible load of responsibility to those who have been trusted and paid by the country to see it adequately defended, and while the "system" is largely responsible for the evils that did and still exist, yet, in the past, individuals have also been to blame, and the sentiment, "It will last my time" has been a common one with those holding high positions.

On the 22nd of May 1897, Lord Beresford spoke at a meeting of the Navy League, at Canning Town:

"Having declared that by some mistake, the government were 15,000 men short of the 100,000 men they said they had, Lord Beresford spoke of the condition of the mercantile marine. It was in a shocking condition and in a very critical state, and unless something were done, when war came about we should be open to an accusation of folly, aye, of criminal folly. Half the men of our mercantile marine were not Britishers, and in his connexion he advocated a revision of the restriction put on shipowners. The Treaty of Paris, we were told, would avoid many of the evils he foresaw; but of all the false and misleading theories he had heard of that was the worst. That Treaty, which was regarded as international law, was signed by one English Minister, but it had never been ratified by Parliament, and he hoped that it would be looked into.

(*Times*, May 24th, 1897.)

The *Times* of September 3rd, 1897 published a letter addressed by Mr. R. H. Macdonald, Lord Beresford's secretary, to Mr. Edward Lovekin; in which he says that —

"while he —[Lord C. B.]— believes authority recognises the position, and made a general attempt to improve the *personnel* of the Royal Naval Reserve, for which reason he forbore to criticise until he had seen the result of their efforts, nothing has yet occured to alter his opinion that the manning of the naval and mercantile marine needs serious over-hauling, and that the conditions of joining and training men of the Royal Naval Reserve require entire alteration."

It does not appear that the Admiralty have since accomplished all the reforms suggested by Lord Beresford — at least if there was any foundation in the following annoncement made by the *Times* on the 2nd of July last:

It is stated that Lord Charles BERESFORD, although entitled to retain his Mediterranean command for another two years, is anxious to be relieved of his official responsibilities next February, his desire being to have a free hand in criticising recent developments in ministerial policy with reference to naval and military administration.

I find in the *Times* of the 27th of June 1901 another opinion, quite instructive, which cannot be attributed to any sentiment of disloyalty:

The following memorandum, dated June 26th, and signed by Mr. H. Seymour Trower, Chairman of the Executive Committee, and Commander W. Caius Crutchley, R. N. R., the Secretary, has been issued by the NAVY LEAGUE:

On October 20th, 1900, the Navy League issued a statement of facts showing that Great Britain, after holding the command of the sea unchallenged for the better part of a century, had lost it because: 1st, Our recent naval programs for men, ships, and material had been insufficient; 2nd, The pro-

grams proposed by the responsible minister and sanctioned by Parliament as the least compatible with safety had not been carried out; 3rd, The ships that were included in our naval estimates, although laid down, had been delayed on the stocks, or were under equipment, until some of them would be half obsolete before they were complete, and a large number of the promised battleships were not yet included on the strength of the navy; 4th, Other nations had ostentatiously and successfully increased their programs of naval construction, thus still further diminishing our relative strength; 5th, A new and resolute claimant for sea-power had arisen.

In the VIIth Chapter of the *Naval Annual* for 1901, Lord BRASSEY confirms entirely what Lord Beresford stated in 1897:

...Fifty years ago we had 200,000 British seamen in our mercantile marine; we have scarcely half that number at the present time... The falling of in numbers is the more deplorable, because it is mainly amongst the younger men. The state of things is grave, and calls for the attention of statesmen. (Page 153.)

If naval and political authorities differ as to the means to be taken for strengthening and improving the organisation of the fleet and its manning, there is one point on which they all agree: the necessity of using the zeal and the enthusiasm of the colonies to increase the *personnel* of the Navy as well as the territorial Army. Let us see now how this problem has been dealt with in the British Parliament for the last few years.

SESSION OF 1898.

On the 11th of March, Sir John COLOMB, M. P., was arraigning the Government in general and the First Lord of the Admiralty in particular for not urging more strongly the Colonies to contribute to the British Navy. He then said:

He —[the First Lord]— told us that Australia was clamouring for naval assistance. Now I think it is time that we should just remind them, in answer to this clamour, that we are bearing almost the whole burden of the cost of the Navy...

Now I hold in my hand a paper: it is the proceedings of a conference held at the Colonial Office between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Premiers of the self-governing colonies in June and July last (1). It is a very remarkable paper, because it gives you what the Secretary of State for the Colonies says and it gives you what the First Lord of the Admiralty says, but it does not give you what the Premiers said.

The Speaker then gives lecture of a statement which, he says, was made by Mr. REID, Prime Minister of New South Wales, on his return from the Jubilee. The text is as follows:

---

(1) See pages III to VII.

The conferences between Mr. Chamberlain and the Colonial Premiers were four in number. On the question of Naval Defence it was evident that the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the First Lord of the Admiralty had first intended, or hoped, that the Australian contribution to Naval Defence would be substantially increased, and that the movements of the Australian Squadron would not be restricted as in the existing agreement. I took advantage of a speech made by Mr. Goschen at the banquet of the Royal Colonial Institute, in order to put an end to any such expectations. I ventured to suggest that we could best do our duty to the Empire by developing the resources of the Australian Continent, and that to cripple our slender finances in order to make a paltry reduction in the cost of the British Navy would not be a good thing for the Mother country or ourselves.

The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. GOSCHEN): I do not accept that statement at all.

(P. D., Vol. 54, pages 1438-39-40.)

On the 18th of March, the First Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. GOSCHEN, referred to the above speech of Sir John Colomb; he said:

My hon. friend alluded to the question of the Jubilee, and suggested that the opportunity afforded by last year's Jubilee should have been utilised to urge upon the Colonial representatives the desirability of increasing the contributions for Imperial defence. The Government, however, were of opinion that to mix up business and hospitality in that way would have been a very questionable proceeding. —

He then reminds that Sir John Colomb wanted him to distribute to the Colonial Delegates a paper showing the proportion of the naval expenditure of the Colonies compared to the proportion of their commerce to the rest of the world. (1)

...No doubt the idea that the Colonies should contribute to the cost of Imperial defence had now taken root to a certain extent, and I hope that it may grow to (be) a very vigorous plant .. (P. D., Vol. 55, page 255.)

Sir Charles DILKE:... When he —[the First Lord]— says it was improper to mix up business with jubilation, he should have been remembered that there were discussions upon this subject, and that business was to that extent mixed up with jubilation... (Page 262.)

I cannot help thinking that in one colony at least it would be possible to try, with every prospect of success, a colonial reserve — namely, in Newfoundland... There is only one colony where there is an excellent, hardy fishing population, but ill-paid and numerous, and there are local circumstances which make it probable that a very large number of fishermen will be induced to accept service of the kind he refers to... (Page 263.)

Mr. GOSCHEN: That is a matter which is under consideration now. I agree with the Right Hon. gentleman that this colony offers the best chances of success in that direction... There are no doubt great administrative difficulties to be overcome, but I will give the matter my best consideration. (Pages 263-4.)

---

(1) See page XVII.

On the 30th of June,

Mr. H.-S. SAMUEL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if, having regard to the admitted want of an efficient naval reserve to man Her Majesty's ships and vessels under stress of war, the Government will take steps to utilise the offers which have been made by Canada, New Zealand and Malta to provide local naval reserves for service in the fleet if required, or to encourage such loyal and patriotic efforts?

The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY: An exposition of the character of the offers which have been made by different colonies in respect of the naval reserve cannot be put into the limits of a ministerial answer at question time, and without explaining the offers it is impossible to explain the difficulties which surround their acceptance, and the doubt as to their providing the results desired. Generally, I may say that I would gladly utilise the sea-faring population of the colonies for increasing our power at sea, but the difficulties in the way of adopting any scheme which has up till now been brought to my notice, have thus far been insuperable. (P. D., Vol. 60, page 639.)

SESSION OF 1899.

During the debate on the Navy Estimates in the House of Commons on the 13th of March, Sir J. COLOMB, having referred to the great increase, in wealth and population, of the British Colonies, said:

...With an Empire with a revenue of 257 millions and with common interest, surely it cannot be expected that only a small part of that revenue should bear forever the whole charge of its defence. When you come to face the problem of how you are going to combine these forces, you are met with this fact, that you cannot force your self-governing colonies to contribute to the common defence. You gave them self-goverment without any reservation, and you must abide in honour by that. But the question is: are we quite right in ignoring these growths, and not paying a little more attention to what lies before us? It strikes me as very remarkable that the First Lord —[of the Admiralty]—... did not see the opportunity and seize it to draw the attention of the public in this country and in our colonies to the fact of the Cape contribution —[of a battleship for the British Navy]— and to the fact that that is the beginning of a policy which must be pursued if the Empire is to survive... Surely the time must come for drawing the attention of Canada to the fact that were circumstances to change in the United Kingdom, their trade might be imperilled, simply because the people of the United Kingdom had got a cold fit about the Navy. My belief is that if you go on as you are going, the time is not far distant when you will have to chose between imperilling the Empire by reducing the Navy or increasing the taxation on the people of this country only to a very serious extent. If then it is discovered, and it will be discovered before long, by the people of this country that they alone are paying for the protection of a trade exceeding in value the total sea-trade of France —a trade that never comes to nor goes from the United Kingdom, you will have this question raised in a hostile spirit, which will be disastrous to the colonies and to ourselves... (P. D., Vol. 68, page 593-594.)

Mr. KEARLEY (Devonport):

It was stated last year by a prominent member of the Canadian Government that there were as many as 76,000 eligible men in Canada well suited to join the Reserve. A deputation was received by the First Lord on this question last year, and he very properly insisted that if entries were to be received from the Colonies for the Reserve that the men should be as well trained as ours, and that they should undertake to go through the same training, put in the same drill, and go afloat for six months. He also offered that if the Canadian Government would pay the expenses of training these men that this country would pay their retainer... (Page 598.)

Sir Chas. DILKE, referring to the speech of Mr. Kearley, said:

My Hon. friend is right in saying that there is a marked decline in the number of boys, and he put forward a remedy to meet that state of things. The time, in my opinion, has come when you ought to look to all possible sources of supply, with the view of increasing the number of the Reserves. (Page 615.)

On the 14th of April, Mr. TREVELYAN, M. P., spoke of the facilities which young colonists should be given to enter the Navy as Cadets; he suggested that examinations should be held in some of the leading colonies; he then added:

We are all, in this House, of course, in favour of Imperial Federation, but hardly any one of us has any particular scheme of uniting our Colonies more closely to ourselves, on which Federation must mainly depend, though we all admit at present that sympathy and sentiment may do something. But there may be ways in which the Colonies and the Mother country may be drawn more closely together, and one of the ways of doing that is by attempting to draw the Colonies into taking some share in the Imperial service... We know the interest the Secretary of the Colonies has in the Colonies, and I think that he is doing a good deal in a quiet way to draw the Colonies and Great Britain together, and I suggest that this is one of those little things which may in the future develop into something very greatly to the advantage of the Empire... (P. D., Vol. 69, pages 1213-4.)

On the 18th of April, Mr. BUCHANAN, M. P., moved a resolution denouncing the increase in national expenditure (P. D., vol. 69, page 1496). He said that the increase of troops in Africa was a reversal of Lord Cardwell's policy with regard to military relations with the Colonies:

I think we should go in the direction of withdrawing Imperial troops as far as possible from these Colonies and making them responsible for their own defence... (Page 1502.)

Mr. SOUTTAR seconded the motion, saying:

...It is time that there was a clear understanding as to what the defence of the Empire implies...

He then explained that Great Britain should defend India and the Crown Colonies, but that the increase of the Army and Navy was due to the necessity of defending the self-governing colonies; he went on:

I do not think that the workingmen of this country should be any longer called upon to bear the defence of the workingmen in Canada, in Australia, in New Zealand and the Cape... They protect against us as severely as any foreign country —

—not a word of the Canadian preferential tariff! —

I have known men go to Canada and be told that Canada was kept for the Canadians, and be forced to return to this country... (Pages 1514-15.)

Sir Charles DILKE moved an amendment excepting the navy from the suggested retrenchment of expenditure; he said:

...Our fleet is not necessitated by the Colonies, but necessitated by our position and trade apart from the question of whether we possess these colonies or not. I entirely concur that it would be immensely advantageous to this country if these colonies should make some sacrifice for naval defence. We all agree with that and if anything prevents our speaking out very strongly on this matter it is from fear that this would do more harm than good. When some of the Colonies are already moving in that direction, to press the matter too rapidly might retard rather than advance the cause we all have at heart... (Page 1519.)

On the 27th of July, Sir Charles DILKE, speaking on the Naval Works Bill, said:

I am anxious that the Colonies should make a contribution towards our naval expenditure; but while that suggestion should be constantly pressed upon the colonies, it is impossible for this country to suspend the expenditure until that is brought about... (P. D., Vol. 75, page 557.)

SESSION OF 1900.

On the 26th of February, the House was discussing the Navy Estimates. The First Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. GOSCHEN, spoke at length on the measures to be taken in order to increase the strength of the Navy and especially the Naval Reserve. He said:

...We are not inquiring as to how we can organise naval reserves in our colonies. The military instincts of the colonies have been so developed in connection with the war in South Africa as to inspire us with the hope that, if we can only find an adequate system of organisation, we shall be able to get valuable contingents for our navy from Australia, Canada, and elsewhere. But there are some difficulties in the way, partly on account of the differences in wages in the colonies and partly because we have not got the same appliances for training in the colonies that we have at home... (P. D., Vol. 79, page 1120.)

It was a well known fact in Ottawa, during the session of 1900, that Sir Louis DAVIES contemplated the organisation of a training ship for Canada. No doubt, if the measure had been brought before the Canadian Parliament, it would have been under the pretence of forming a naval reserve for Canada. The above declaration from the British Minister shows us what was the real object in view: recruiting for the British Navy.

Sir Charles DILKE said:

Suggestions have been made with regard to the Colonies. The First Lord in previous debates anticipated the difficulties with regard to wages in Australia, and with regard to Canada there are difficulties with which the Admiralty is familiar. But the First Lord did not mention the case of Newfoundland, where the wages are very low and where there is an enormous fishing population which would be available under a scheme similar to our own.

Mr. GOSCHEN: That has been done.

Sir Charles DILKE: I am very glad to hear that, because I am certain there is an enormous reserve proportionately to the population to be obtained in Newfoundland... (P. D., Vol. 79, page 1167.)

Mr. Goschen was true to his word. In the *Naval Annual* for 1901 (page 32), Commander C. N. ROBINSON, R. N., says:

A branch of the Royal Naval Reserve has been established in the North American colonies, and fifty seamen from Newfoundland have been embarked in ships on that station for six months' training.

On the 19th of July, Lord BRASSEY raised a debate in the House of Lords on "The Reserve forces of Australia" (1). Speaking of the contribution of Australia to the Navy, and of the restrictions imposed by the Australian Governments, he said:

The true feeling in the Colonies must be gauged by recent events. When we stood in a recent crisis face to face with the sudden emergency in China, no objection was urged to the removal of certain vessels from the Australian squadron to China. The Colonies offered a ship which has been accepted; they offered the services of their naval brigades, which have also been accepted. What has happened lately I feel sure would happen again. I feel certain that all the available naval forces of the Australian Colonies will at all times be available for Imperial defence... (P. D., Vol. 86, page 439.)

Viscount FRANKFORT brought the attention of the War Secretary on a letter of Major General FRENCH "On Colonial Reserves", which had appeared in the *Times* of July 12th.

---

(1) See page LXIV.

I quote the following extracts from that letter:

The present war in South Africa has demonstrated the fact that the defence of the British Empire in the future is not a question to be left wholly to the people of the British Isles, but that the English-speaking people throughout the Empire are willing to take their share in its defence and provide the men, and possibly the money, therefor.

Having had an experience of a dozen years in Canada, and a similar amount in Australia, mostly with Colonial forces, I would like to make two points clear:

1. It is idle to hope or expect that any large force of Imperial troops paid at Imperial rates could be raised in these colonies for ordinary garrison work or duties in peace time;

2. It is equally certain that thousands of men can be raised in war time, who will engage for the war at a fair rate of pay.

He then explains, as to the first point, that the average wages paid in Australia would prevent any amount of people joining the army; and as to the second point, he emphasises the enthusiasm and the readiness with which the Australians have enlisted for the South African war.

The real way, in my opinion, to help Old England to keep the flag flying all over the Empire is to form "War Reserves" in the colonies. In doing so, the specialities of the colonies should be borne in mind; thus Canada with her 75,000 sailors and fishermen on the Atlantic seaboard should provide a large "War Reserve" for the Fleet, and probably would do so if the Admiralty, instead of framing cast-iron regulations suitable for Great Britain, would appreciate the fact that the most suitable time to carry out the training of these fishermen would be the time of year when they could not carry on their usual avocations.

The rest of the letter is devoted to the means that should be taken in order to organise a large Army Reserve in the Australian Colonies. It ends with this most suggestive sentence:

NOW IS THE TIME TO ACT; IF WE WAIT TILL THE COLD FIT COMES ON, PROGRESS MAY BE MADE IMPOSSIBLE.

This letter, dated, Sydney, New South Wales, May 8th, is written and signed by Major General French, in his official capacity as Officer Commanding the militia in that colony, i. e., the same position as that occupied by Major General Hutton in Canada. This proves, I think, what kind of work has been performed by those gentlemen in the Colonies, under the direction of the present Imperial Administration.

Coming back to the House of Lords, — the Marquess of LANSDOWNE, Secretary of State for War, said:

My Lords, with the general principle laid down by the two noble Lords who have addressed your Lordships, I desire to express my entire concur-

rence and sympathy... I am sure we all of us feel that this cooperation of the colonial forces has not been the result of any passing mood on their part; it is not a mere momentary effervescence of loyalty, it is the result of a deep-seated patriotism and an abiding desire to bear with us a part in the burden of Empire. I am sure one and all of us would wish and hope that if this country should find itself again circumstanced as it has been of late we should find the colonies ready to take their place by our side. And if it would be possible, as the noble Lord behind me desired, for us to come to some understanding with the colonies by which that cooperation might be rendered easier both for them and for us, I for one should greatly rejoice at it. But I venture to suggest that the matter is one in which we can scarcely proceed with too much caution... (P. D., Vol. 86, pages 441-2-3.)

...I can only add to what I have said that, agreeably to the suggestion of the noble Lord behind me, I shall make it my business, in consultation with the Secretary for the Colonies, to advance the policy the noble Lord has advocated as much as we can possibly advance it... (Page 447.)

Earl CARRINGTON:... I hardly think that the colonists themselves know how deep-seated that patriotism is. It seems to me to be like one of those great Australian underground rivers that disappear in the bowels of the earth, and then come up again, and appear and disappear again, and then when they are tapped they rise in a huge geyser, finally rushing down in a mighty torrent to the ocean. I think we can always rely on having the colonies on our side, but it must be on one condition. This country must recognise that there must be perfect equality between the soldiers of our great self-governing colonies and the English, Scotch, Welsh and Irish troops... (Page 448.)

SESSION OF 1901.

On the 21st of March, the House in Committee was discussing the Navy Estimates; Mr. Edmund ROBERTSON said:

...I deny that it is the right or the duty of this country to go on, unaided, bearing this tremendous Imperial burden of naval expenditure... This Government seems to blind itself to the fact, and the country also knows it not, that this noble Navy of ours... is as much the servant of our self-governing colonies — I say nothing of the others — as it is of the people of England, Scotland, or Ireland... The poorest mill girl who drinks tea in my constituency has to pay for the free naval defence of the millionnaire squatters of Australia and the millionnaire timbermen of Canada... I challenge him —[the Secretary to the Admiralty, Mr. Arnold Forster]— to say whether we are going on forever adding to the expenditure for the Navy without making the faintest suggestion that these great self-governing colonies might contribute from their wealth to the Navy, which now is supported by the farthings of the poor as much as by the pounds of the rich in the United Kingdom. (P. D., Vol. 91, pages 782-3.)

Sir John COLOMB:... We have approached a time when we must ask this question — "Can we go on indefinitely paying for the defence of an Empire which covers all parts of the world out of the resources of an Island in but a corner of it?" I am a true Imperialist — I have always been that; but I hate the Imperialism which perorates about the Empire and refuses to face the real question of making the arrangements for its common security a matter of practical and united action of all its parts... (Page 783.)

On the 22nd of March, during the same debate, the Secretary to the Admiralty, Mr. ARNOLD FORSTER, replying to Mr. Robertson, said:

There was one point in the speech of the Hon. and learned member with which I am specially sympathetic. He spoke, as he has often spoken before in this House, about the desirability, almost the necessity, of sharing the burden of Naval defence with those other great members of our Imperial community which get the benefit of that defence... I can only say that there will be no want of cooperation on our part which may produce such a state of feelings in our colonies as to bring about the most desirable result wished for by the Hon. and learned member... I am not quite sure that the shortest and most certain way to obtain the cooperation we desire is to blame the colonies for not having given that which they have not been asked to give. We may take a lesson from the old fable, and believe that the sun will induce a man to take off his cloak sooner than the storm. (P. D., Vol. 91, page 979.)

On the 25th of March, in the same debate, Mr. William REDMOND said:

...Before increasing the number of men in the Navy he would like to hear whether the Government had put themselves into communication with the great self-governing colonies of the Empire, and asked them whether they were prepared to bear any share of the enormous cost which this great increase involved... (P. D., Vol. 91, page 1131.)

The Secretary to the ADMIRALTY replied that:

He was very much in sympathy with the views of the Hon. member for East Clare, and he most fervently desired that we should have contributions from all our great colonies to our navy as well as to our army. (Page 1132.)

Commenting upon this debate, *The Army and Navy Gazette* said on the 30th of March 1901:

The Canadians have not yet risen to a proper sense of their obligations to the Navy; they contribute nothing to the maintenance of the fleet and the preservation of their sea-trade. On the other hand, it is unwise to lose sight of the consideration that the United Kingdom could ill-afford to reduce its Navy even if we lost most of our Colonies. This aspect of the question is seldom dealt with by the reformers.

I may add here what Mr. ASQUITH said at Edinburgh, on the 16th of October last. After having insisted strenuously on the imperative necessity for England of maintaining her Navy in the most effective condition, he said:

Why, if you once lost command of the sea you would be starved into submission before a single foreign soldier had occasion to set his foot upon your shores. (From the Montreal *Herald*, October 31st, 1901.)

In 1893, Sir Charles TUPPER, then High Commissioner in London, dealt with the same subject at a banquet in Winnipeg. He said:

I deny that we are a burden to the Empire. I say that if to-morrow Canada became a portion of that great Republic which lies to the South of us, England could not reduce her Army by a man, nor her Navy by a ship. She would want more soldiers, and sailors and ironclads than she has to-day in order to maintain her prestige... (Winnipeg *Free Press,* September 20th, 1893.)

He then went on, explaining that we had directly or indirectly contributed to the defence of the Empire in various ways and to an amount which he figured at $180,000,000.

These opinions, coupled with that expressed by Sir Charles Dilke on the 18th of April 1899 (1) — all coming from avowed Imperialists — should smooth our conscience as to our obligations towards Great Britain.

OPINION OF SIR JOHN HOPKINS.

Since I have given my lecture at Montreal, we have had another well defined expression of opinion, and from a most competent authority, on the necessity of drawing help from the colonies.

On the 23rd of October last, the London Chamber of Commerce gave its first monthly dinner for the session 1901-1902, under the presidency of Lord Brassey, President of the Chamber and late Governor of Victoria. The subject of discussion was "The Navy and Colonial defence".

Sir G. S. CLARKE, Governor of Victoria, said:

...The action of the Navy was essentially offensive. Of late years, we had too much before us the defensive idea and it was largely because of that that the present war, which called for the offensive on a large scale, found us somewhat unprepared...

Thanks to the splendid spirit of the Colonies, our army in South Africa was reinforced by gallant men from all parts of the Empire. That proved that in a time of need, if our quarrel was just, we could count on the assistance of our fellow-subjects in every part of the world. Our indebtedness to the colonies for coming to our help in the day of need showed the importance —

— not of expressing gratitude, as some might think, but

— of expanding and developing the local forces of the Empire. It was sometimes said that the colonies ought to submit a scheme of Imperial defence. He

---

(1) See page LXXVIII.

thought that was the duty of people at home rather than of the colonies. It was for us to frame a scheme of Imperial defence, and, with the assistance of the colonies, to fill up the details. If we desired to maintain the headship of the Empire we must lead in all things.

Admiral Sir J.-O. HOPKINS said that when he was in Australia, years ago, there was no local force, the people being too occupied in digging gold and making themselves a great nation. Since then the people of Australia had spent a certain amount of money on ships, but those ships were now all obsolete. In future the policy of colonial defence, so far as the Navy was concerned, must be to send out good ships manned by British seamen. But if in time of need the colonies offered volunteers for the Navy they should not be snubbed with the remark, "What do you know about the sea?" They would soon learn all about the sea. He was aware that on the coast of Canada there were 40,000 fishermen inured to the sea in its severest and most dangerous aspects, and that to-morrow, if only some one would hold up his hand, 10,000 of these hardy men would join the Navy. Some of the men had been taken to sea and reports about them proved that they were the very best of seamen.

(*Times*, October 24th, 1901.)

NAVAL RESERVE IN CANADA.

As one may have noticed, correspondences and negociations with Canadian authorities on the matter of a naval reserve, are not unfrequently mentioned in the above quotations.

When Sir Louis DAVIES, Canadian Minister of Marine, was in London in 1899 he had some conversations with the Imperial authorities on that matter. As usual, when Imperialistic questions are at stake, the Canadian people have been kept in the dark.

On the 7th of March 1900, I put the following question to the Government in the House of Commons:

1. Has the attention of the Government been called to the declaration made last week in the British Commons by the Right Hon. Mr. Goschen, First Lord of the Admiralty, which declaration was reported as follows by the Associated Press:

"COLONIAL NAVAL RESERVE."

"The Admiralty was considering how it could organise a naval reserve in conjunction with the colonies. He explained that with an adequate organisation the government could get a very valuable contingent from Canada and Australia. The negotiations with Canada were very well advanced. Canada had asked that the period of training be reduced, but a final decision on the subject had not been reached?"

2. Have any negotiations been conducted, or are there any going on at the present time between the British government and the Canadian government, or any member of said governments in relation to the subject mentioned by Mr. Goschen?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid LAURIER): The attention of the government has been called to the report of the declaration said to have been made by Mr. Goschen; but the government do not think it would be wise to take official notice of a report of that kind, without having seen

the words of the minister himself. In the meantime, I may say that no arrangement has been made and no negotiations have been carried on, but there have been informal communications between this government and the Imperial authorities on the subject.

("Debates of the House of Commons," 1900, Vol. I, page 1473.)

But what was informal and even unknown to the Canadian Parliament, was well known in London. The Toronto *Globe* of May 12th 1899 gave an extract from an article of the *London Letter* in which it was said:

Australia has long contributed in cash towards the maintenance of a squadron of small cruisers; Cape Colony proposes to find the interest on the cost of a battleship, Natal offers free coal and now Canada proposes to find trained men. In spite of Mr. Goschen's optimistic assurances, we must regard Canada's contribution as the most valuable of all. It may be as easy as is asserted by the First Lord of the Admiralty to obtain as many men as are required for the Navy itself. It is certainly not so easy to find the requisite number of suitable men for the Royal Navy Reserve. At the present moment if we had to mobilise in earnest, every available man from the Royal Navy and the Reserve alike would be required to man our existing ships. We have no real reserve. Moreover, we are increasing the number of our ships each year, and we shall not have the men to put on board them. Another argument in favour of the Canadian proposal is that it is desirable to have trained men available on the spots to fill up the gaps created in action. By all means let the Admiralty do everything it can, not only to aid the Dominion Government in giving effect to its scheme, but to induce the Governments of other self-governing colonies to follow a similar plan.

Sir Louis DAVIES admitted himself at a meeting of the Canadian branch of the British Empire League, held in Ottawa in April 1900 that "he had the honour of discussing it with Mr. Goschen, and matters had progressed fairly well." (1)

I have it from the most reliable authority, though I could not divulge the name, that in the summer of 1899, General Hutton asked a French Canadian officer of the militia to prepare an estimate of the number of young men who could be enlisted for the British Navy in the Quebec counties on both shores of the Lower St. Lawrence.

---

(1) See page CXV.

V

Commercial Imperialism: Its stagnation.

We have seen that, while admitting the existence of certain obstacles in the way of military Imperialism, British statesmen never offered the slightest opposition to any policy which could bring the Colonies to contribute to the support of their Army and Navy. On the contrary, they never lost the opportunity of assuring Parliament and the people of Great Britain of their earnest efforts in that direction. "Let us be prudent, "they say," let us proceed with caution and diplomacy, and the end will be reached."

Let us see how the very few propositions made in the British Parliament in favour of better commercial terms for the Colonies were considered by Her Majesty's advisers.

On the 27th of April 1897,

Mr. J.-F. HOGAN, M. P.: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies 1° whether he has observed that the new Canadian tariff provides for preferential trade relations with the Mother country; and 2° whether Her Majesty's Government will embrace the earliest opportunity of recognising and, if practicable, reciprocating the action of the Government of the Dominion in this important matter?

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN): The answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the affirmative. Her Majesty's Government cordially appreciate the friendly spirit which is shewn by the action of the Dominion Government, but I understand that the proposals do not depend on any alteration of the system of free trade established in the United Kingdom. (P. D., Vol. 48, page 1138.)

We will now see what happened with three motions of a similar nature of which Sir Howard VINCENT was either the father or the chief supporter. These motions were made in 1897, 1899 and 1901. It would be hard to detect through the debates which those proposals gave rise to, a conspicuous progress of that reciprocal love which "the blood shed in a common cause" is supposed to have so strongly developed.

FIRST MOTION, 1897.

On the 27th of April, Sir Howard VINCENT moved that a duty of ten per cent *ad valorem* be imposed upon all fully manufactured goods, and of five per cent upon partly manufactured articles, imported in the United Kingdom from foreign countries — thereby offering colonial goods the benefit of that differential duty — the proceeds of those taxes to be applied to forming a national fund for the granting of pensions to old aged people of the working classes. Sir Howard insisted on the enormous increase of foreign importations to the detriment of British industry. He also pointed out the policy inaugurated by the Canadian Government, saying:

> The important step just taken in this direction by the Dominion of Canada [*Cheers*] could not fail not only to be very gratefully received in this country, but also to contribute very materially to the development of trade within the Empire... (P. D., Vol. 48, page 1172.)

The Rt. Hon. A. J. BALFOUR, First Lord of the Treasury, explained in a few words why the British Government could not see their way to taking any step contrary to the tradional free trade policy of Great Britain. He admitted, however, the danger that was threatening British manufactures, but he said that the great consuming classes were not prepared to raise the cost of their most required articles of consumption. He did not make the slightest reference to the preferential tariff of Canada. He promised that the attention of the Government would be directed to the question of Old Age Pensions (pages 1173-1179).

Sir Howard Vincent said that after this promise, he was ready to withdraw his motion.

SECOND MOTION, 1899.

During the session of 1899, the Chancellor of the Exchequer introduced in his Finance Bill a clause by which the duties on imported wines were raised.

On the 11th of May, Sir Howard VINCENT moved an amendment to the effect of excluding from the extra duties all wines "produced in any British Colony or possession." (P. D. Vol. 71, page 370). He said that his amendment did not spring —

> — from any desire on the part of any British Colony or colonial Government to interfere in the slightest degree with the fiscal arrangements of this country, but rather from a genuine desire on behalf of a great mass of the people in this country to give better trading terms to their own kith and kin than to foreigners... (Pages 370-371.)

He evoked the Jubilee celebration, the Colonial Conferences of 1887 and 1897, and the numerous evidences given by the British Government and especially by the Colonial Secretary in favour of closer relations with the colonies. He ended with these words:

This course would encourage the development of trade in all parts of the British Empire, and stimulate that healthy feeling which in recent years had existed between the motherland and her daughter colonies. (Page 378.)

The Chancellor, Sir Michael HICKS BEACH, refused positively to accept the amendment, saying:

It is not a financial matter of any great importance, but my hon. friend has raised a principle the importance of which I do not think he has adequately represented to the Committee, and it is for that reason, and not on account of the small sum involved, that I feel compelled to object to his proposal... What my hon. friend,... asks me to do is to adopt a precedent which would involve a return to a system of differential duties in regard to our colonies, which was abolished forty years ago... Is my hon. friend prepared, or is the Committee prepared, to impose a differential duty — which will have to be of a substantial amount to be of any use — on corn and timber from foreign countries in favour of corn or timber from Canada?... Now, whatever the force of sentiment in this matter, and I admit the force is very great indeed, surely the sentiment might be tempered with a little business-like consideration... (Pages 379, 381, 383 and 384.)

He then spoke of the high protective duties imposed by the Colonies on British goods, without the slightest allusion to the preferential tariff adopted by Canada two years previous; and he ended as follows:

I say that in such a case as this, to my mind, it would be utterly unreasonable that we who bear the burdens of Empire should surrender our fiscal freedom in the way my hon. friend proposes... (Page 387.)

Sir Henry FOWLER supported strongly the views of the Chancellor. He ended his remarks by saying:

...I hope every gentleman on this side of the House, will support the Government in its resistance to the retrograde policy which is involved in the proposal of the hon. Member. (Page 389.)

It is the same gentleman who was to exclaim, a few months later:

These independent, self-governing communities, have shown not merely by eloquent words or by enthusiastic cheers, but by spontaneously sending forth thousands of their sons to fight and to die for their fatherland that our Empire is one and indivisible, and that if ever it should be in peril from stress or storm it can summon to its defence a vast army of men of every class and creed and clime...

Our determination is to maintain our colonies, and to link them to each other and to us by even closer ties... (1)

---

(1) See page XLVII.

The change of rhetorics is wonderful. Sir Henry Fowler is one of the leading liberal Imperialists: *ab uno, disce omnes.*

Mr. James LOWTHER, M. P., took the opposite view and said that —

...The want of sympathy of his Right Hon. friend towards this question of inter-British trade was lamentable. Here was an opportunity for the Government to perform a graceful act which would have been much appreciated by our Colonies, and which would have cost a mere *bagatelle*, but his Right Hon. friend had discarded that opportunity, and had taken refuge in the miserable platitudes of the Cobden Club. (Page 390.)

Sir Howard Vincent's motion was defeated by 192 votes against 37.

This was after the Jubilee but before the South African war. Let us see now what has been the result of our devotion to the motherland, as far as our interests are concerned.

THIRD MOTION, 1901.

On the 20th of June last, the second clause of the Finance Bill, imposing import duties on sugar, was discussed in the House of Commons, in Committee. I take the following extracts from the Parliamentary reports of the London *Times*, June 21st 1901:

Mr. FLOWER (Bradford W.) moved the first of two amendments, the effect of which was to reduce the duty on sugar imported from "His Majesty's Colonies or possessions" by 33⅓ per cent. He said that —

...Canada had carried out a proposal which had extorted enthusiasm from this country; and he submitted that, in view not only of what Canada had done but of what Australia was capable of doing, the Chancellor of the Exchequer should make a serious attempt to consider the question of an inter-Empire preferential tariff. If our Colonies were prepared on certain questions to meet us, ought we not to be prepared to meet them?... The time was ripe for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to respond in a sympathetic spirit to the proposals of the Colonies...

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael HICKS-BEACH said:

It would not only deprive the Exchequer of a third of the Revenue on sugar coming from British possessions; it would also impose that third upon the consumers of sugar in this country, for it was obviously clear that consumers here would pay just as much for colonial sugar paying two thirds duty as for foreign sugar paying the full duty. Therefore, not only would the Exchequer be deprived of a certain amount of revenue, but it would impose that amount on the consumer for the benefit of the colonial producer... In pursuance of the same policy, Canada might ask that a duty

should be imposed on our corn and flour imported not produced in Canada, and similar claims might be advanced on behalf of Canadian timber, Australian wool, and meat from New Zealand, and so on, through all articles preference would be claimed for colonial produce... If, on the other hand, we refused to foreign nations the treatment extended to our Colonies, what would happen? We had an export trade with foreign countries double the amount of the trade with our colonies, and were we prepared to risk the loss of this trade by declining to give foreign countries in return for the same concessions the treatment we gave to the Colonies?...

Sir Howard VINCENT regretted the speech they had just heard, and thought it unfortunate that the Secretary for the Colonies was absent... As to whether such treatment would be advantageous to the Colonies, would his Right Hon. friend say that the preference granted to British goods by Canada was of no advantage to British trade?

The Chancellor of the EXCHEQUER thought the Hon. member could not find that any great improvement of the trade between Great Britain and Canada was due to that preference, for the simple reason that the preference still left a protective duty as against the British manufacturer in favour of the Canadian manufacturer, and the result was that, although our trade in Canada had largely increased, the trade of the United States with Canada had also largely increased.

Sir H. VINCENT said that the facts published by the Canadian government and the statistics of the Board of Trade showed that since this preference was granted, British trade with Canada had increased. They owed an enormous debt to Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the boldness with which he had advocated these proposals and for his firm attitude during the general election last year...

Sir W. HARCOURT said... They all recognised the zeal and valour with which the Empire across the seas had sent their forces to aid in this war; but the taxation for the war would not fall upon them, but upon the petty population of 40,000,000 who occupied little England. And the proposal was that the workingmen, on whom this taxation would fall, were to have an additional burden put upon them in order to give relief to those who did not pay the taxes...

Mr. Henniker HEATON (Canterbury) said that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer could see his way to agree to the amendment the greatest enthusiasm would be felt... A motion such as that which was now before the Committee would promote kindly feeling towards England, and its rejection, after such a sacrifice as Canada had made, would cause great disappointment in that part of the Empire. It would be thought that we did not care about the Colonies when dealing with questions of taxation...

The Chancellor of the EXCHEQUER said he felt strongly the kindliness and good will shown by the action of Canada. But, greatly as he valued that kindness, he thought the action itself was of far more importance than the actual effect it would have upon a great industry.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen S.) said that... He held that the more this proposal was examined the more its impracticability was demonstrated, but it would be of great benefit if the debate and the firm stand which had been taken prevented these proposals from being put forward in the future.

When the division was called much amusement was created on the opposition side of the House by the apparent inhability of Sir Howard Vincent to secure the services of a co-teller. The hon. member, amid a good deal of ironical cheering and laughter, crossed the floor of the House and attempted to induce some members of the opposition sitt ng below the gangway to come to his aid. No disposition, however, was shown in that quarter to help him, nor was he more successful in his appeals to hon. members sitting behind the Treasury bench. The result was that both he and Mr. Flower evinced a desire to withdraw the amendment, but the opposition forced a division, the Chairman naming, amid general amusement, Mr. Kearley and Mr. Lough —[both opposed to the amendment]— as tellers for the amendment.

The Committee divided and the numbers were

For the Amendment..	16
Against..	366
Majority..	350

The announcement of the numbers was received with cheers and laughter. (The *Times*, June 21st, 1901).

It does not appear that the "enormous debt" of gratitude towards Canada and Sir Wilfrid Laurier weighs very heavily upon British representatives.

As a striking illustration of the simple mindedness of the colonists and the stubborn self-love of the British, it may be interesting to observe that the motions which I brought before the Parliament of Canada to assert the principle that Canadians should stay at home and look after themselves, was met by the same crush at the hands of our inflamed loyalists as the proposition laid down by Sir Howard Vincent, that Great Britain should reciprocate in good treatment towards the Colonies, was at the hands of the British Parliament.

VI

Further evidences of the Indifference of Great Britain.

1°. Pacific Cable.

The urgency of this question was discussed at the Jubilee Imperial Conference. The British authorities had evidently made up their mind that the larger share of the construction and the maintenance of the Cable should be assumed by the Colonies, in spite of the great benefit to be derived by Great Britain from that new inter-Imperial means of communication; and so it followed that the Colonial delegates did not then come to a final understanding. Negotiations went on for one year, after which the Australasian colonies decided to pay eight eighteenths of the total cost, and in 1899, Canada assumed the responsibility of five eighteenths;—thus leaving five eighteenths, i. e., a share equal to that of Canada, to be borne by Great Britain.

After many hesitations and delays, the British Government offered to bear five eighteenths of the possible loss of revenue, "provided priority be given to Imperial Government messages and that they be transmitted at half ordinary rates."

This raised the indignation of Sir Sandford FLEMING, the long time promoter of this great enterprise, and a convinced Imperialist. The eminent engineer gave vent to his sentiments in a letter which was published in the Toronto *Globe*, on the 8th of May 1899; the following is an extract from that letter:

...It is impossible to believe that it is the full or final judgment of Her Majesty's Home Government, for the following reasons, viz:

1° It would always be regarded as a recession on the part of the Mother country from a common understanding with Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

2° It would always be regarded as an attempt to retard the expansion and cripple the commerce of the Empire, in the interest of a few rich monopolists.

3° It would always be regarded by the people of Canada, Australia and New Zealand as an unjustifiable and discourteous act to them.

4° Its effect would be far reaching, and its immediate effect would be a fatal blow to the scheme for establishing a system of State-owned British cables encircling the globe.

5° It would be a very grave retrograde step in the Imperial movement which aims to draw closer the bonds between the Mother country and her daughter lands.

Sir Sandford then gave the whole history of the scheme, stating plainly that the decision of the British Government was due to the influence of the monopolising Cable companies. As to Canada's interest in the matter, he said:

It is a mistake to suppose that a Pacific cable is greatly required by Canada for purely Canadian purposes. While it is necessary to Australasians and their correspondents in the United Kingdom to have an alternative line in order that correspondence may be facilitated and never interrupted, it is not so indispensable to the Dominion. It must be recognised by all that Canada is moved not by necessity, not by narrow selfish consideration, but by her zeal for Imperial unity.

In spite of this urgent and eloquent appeal, it took over two years more to bring the British authorities to the fulfilment of their engagements. It is only in August last that Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Financial Secretary to the Treasury, finally brought before the House a bill providing for the expenditure, out of the British Exchequer, of five eighteenths of the cost of construction. It thus took over four years to bring the British Government to assume a share equal to that of Canada in the cost of an enterprise which, according to the most reliable authority on the matter, is far more useful to Great Britain and to Australasia than it is to Canada.

It is worth while comparing some of the remarks that were made in the Canadian Parliament upon this question with the arguments used in the British Parliament.

On the 25th of July 1899, the Hon. Wm. MULOCK introduced a resolution in the Canadian Commons, for the purpose of enabling the Government to assume the responsibility, in capital and interest, of five eighteenths of the debentures to be issued for the construction of the cable — the total capital amount being limited to £1,700,000. Canada was also made responsible, in the same proportion, for her share of the possible deficits in the running expenditure. He explained that the colonies of New Zealand, Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria had assumed the responsibility of two eighteenths each, making, for the four of them, eight eighteenths; and that Great Britain was to pay the balance, that is, five eighteenths. (*Debates* of the House of Commons, 1899, Vol. III, page 8354).

He then added that the Board of Directors would be composed of eight members; and that, according to the relative responsibilities assumed, Australasia should be represented by 3-5/9, Canada by 2-2/9, and Great Britain by 2-2/9. He said:

As this scheme will be largely centered in Great Britain, and as the British Government will be largely interested in its management, it became necessary, in the first place, to arrange how the respective Governments were to be represented... Australasia has given over her 5/9, and we, our little surplus of 2/9, and allowed Great Britain, which would also be entitled to 2-2/9 in the representation, the benefit of this surplus, so that Australia will have three representatives, Great Britain will have three and Canada two, making eight in all... (Pages 8354-55.)

As usual the lion got the lion's share..... in the control.

Sir Charles TUPPER, Leader of the Opposition, said:

...From an Imperial point of view, I feel that England would have dishonoured herself if she had lost the opportunity that was presented of taking her share, and of implementing the action of Australia and of Canada in bringing this to a successful termination... The importance of this enterprise to the interests of the Empire cannot be over estimated, for, assuming that this enterprise could not be a commercial success, assuming that the entire expense was sunk without any prospect of return, still England might at no distant date be called upon to expend treble the amount in order to repair a disaster that could not occur if this Pacific cable were in operation. To Australasia it is a matter of the most vital import, it is a matter upon which not only their trade, but the security of their country, might, at no distant date, absolutely depend... It is of immense consequence to her —[Britain]— that she should be able to hold secret and confidential communications of the most important character between the seat of government in London and Canada and Australia without the possibility of foreign intervention, or of cable communication being interfered with... (Page 8366.)

Several speeches were delivered on both sides of the House, all ringing with the glory of Empire, Mr. John CHARLTON, M. P., being the only opponent of the scheme.

The purport of the resolution was embodied in "The Pacific Cable Act, 1899" (62-63 Vic. Cap. 3).

The next year, the announcement had come, as referred to in the above quoted letter of Sir Sandford Fleming, that the British Government were going back on their pledges. The matter was brought in the House of Commons at Ottawa, by Mr. BELCOURT, M. P., for Ottawa City. He read resolutions adopted by the Ottawa Board of Trade insisting on the necessity of carrying out the scheme and stated that

...obstacles have been occasioned largely through the opposition of a monopoly called the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company... (*Debates,* 1900, Vol. III, page 7041.)

Sir Charles TUPPER said:

...I think we all agree that not only commercially, but from a strategic point of view, the construction of the Pacific cable from Vancouver or Victoria to Australia, is a matter of deep moment. It is impossible, in my judgment, to overrate its importance to Australia. It is also commercially and in every other way, a matter of great importance to Canada, and of still greater importance to the United Kingdom... In the case of war between a European power and England, the communication with Australia could be easily cut off, and a great deal of damage done by the enemy, before it became known. Canada is not so directly interested, but Canada is a component part of the Empire, and as such deeply interested in every thing that tends to a closer commercial intercommunication between the various parts of the Empire... Every thing that Canada could be asked to do, she has done, and it would be greatly to be deplored, if any action should be taken by any one of the parties concerned, without the absolute consent and approval of the others... (Pages 7048-49.)

This was a reference to the arrangement reported as having been entered into recently between the Governments of Victoria and New South Wales and the Eastern Extension Company. This proved afterwards to be accurate: the new contract was signed two weeks after the agreement with England and Canada had been concluded.

Mr. MULOCK, who had been made the patron of the scheme in Canada, did not conceal his anxieties:

I cannot conceive that there is any real foundation for this rumour and the Imperial Government not take the Canadian Government into its confidence. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the failure of this scheme would be a national calamity. Perhaps he is right in saying that it chiefly concerns Australia. When I took up this subject, I was of that opinion and had difficulty in discerning the Canadian interests in it. But, as I studied it, I came to the conclusion that we were common partners in the scheme, and, without nicely weighing the relative interests of the different parts of the Empire in it, it is a scheme that so concerns the Empire that, whether Canada is more or less concerned in it, if we are to take an interest in what concerns the Empire, we should give this scheme our unqualified allegiance... (Page 7050-51.)

As usual, Canada plays the part of the sentimental paying partner. It is rather amusing to think that in a scheme where Canada takes a hand for the benefit of others she should be the most zealous in tendering her help and money, while the true interested parties, Great-Britain and Australasia, raise the obstacles and delays.

We did not stop there. At the following session the Government brought an amendment to the Pacific Cable Act, extending the limit of debentures to be issued for the construction of the cable from £1,700,000 to £2,000,000, and increasing thereby Canada's responsibility to five eighteenths of the surplus. The best of it was the reason given by Mr. MULOCK for this increase of our liability: he said that the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company having acquired

new rights in Australasia, which the minister could not conceive to be true a year previous, the Pacific Cable Board was bound to indemnify them (*Debates*, House of Commons, 1901, Vol. I, pages 896-897). In other words, we had to become responsible for five eighteenths of the amount required to redeem the broken pledges of two of the most directly interested parties in this agreement.

Let us now go across to Westminster.

On the 31st July last, Mr. Austen CHAMBERLAIN, Financial Secretary to the Treasury, reported to the House a resolution adopted in Committee, authorising the British Government to raise funds to the extent of £2,000,000 for the construction of the Pacific Cable — with the understanding that Canada and Australasia would be responsible for the share which they had already assumed, as above stated. Mr. Chamberlain said:

The colonial Legislatures had passed legislation accepting their share of responsibility for the interest and sinking fund and for any extra cost there might be above the receipts in the early years of the working of the cable... and the Government could not and would not lightly refuse their co-operation in a great Imperial undertaking when it was asked for by those self-governing colonies. It was also of great advantage to this country that there should be an alternative line to those which already existed to Australasia, by which messages could be sent without touching foreign territory... Because of the strategic importance of the cable in time of war, because of its commercial importance in times of peace, and because, too, of the deep interest felt in it by the Governments of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, His Majesty's Government had entered into an agreement with the Colonies to bear their part in this great Imperial undertaking... (P. D., Vol. 98, page 778.)

On the 12th of August, the second reading of the Bill was moved.

Mr. FLYNN said:

...There is not an argument left in this enterprise; it is nothing but another development of the shoddy Imperialism which has met us at every turn in this House for the last two years... (P. D., Vol. 99, page 485.)

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON said:

...I will leave other speakers to deal with the terms of the contract. All I know is that the Canadian Government are doing the lion's share of the work. I know it is the intention of the Canadian Government, as I hope it is of the English Government also, to construct a cable from England to Canada, and I look forward to the day when we shall have six penny telegrams to India, shilling telegrams to Australia and penny telegrams to America. I am sure that that day will come; and I regard the scheme now before the House as a great step forward towards the breaking up of one of the greatest monopolies the world has ever seen, and towards the consolidation of the Empire. (Pages 487-488.)

Mr. Austen CHAMBERLAIN said:

...This is the first time when our great self-governing colonies have approached this country with a proposal for combined action in a great commercial undertaking... We hold that this country has an interest, if not as great as that of the colonies, at any rate a great interest, in promoting these trade communications and increasing these cable facilities. We hold that the construction of this cable will be of material advantage to us in time of war, and we ask the House to ratify the agreement we have made to carry out the undertaking which has already been ratified by every colonial Government concerned — an undertaking which will form, I hope, a lasting and successful monument to the co-operation between the colonies and the Mother country. (Pages 494-495.)

2°. Embargo on Canadian Cattle.

Some years ago, the British Board of Agriculture imposed some very stringent restrictions on the importation of live cattle from America. This was done under the pretence of preventing the introduction and the spreading in England of pleuro-pneumonia. Under the new regulations, all cattle had to be slaughtered at the port of entry. This told heavily on stock-raising and cattle trade in Canada. In 1895 or 1896, the British Parliament ratified by law the rules of the Board of Agriculture. Canadian stock-raisers and traders vainly endeavoured to have the restrictions removed as far as Canadian cattle were concerned. Our Agriculture Department had thorough examinations performed and exhaustive reports published,proving conclusively that Canadian cattle were most healthy,— much more so than the British stocks — and that although a few traces of the disease had been found in years past, it had now entirely disappeared. Several stock-raisers of Scotland have petitioned the British Government on the matter, stating that the importation of Canadian cattle would be of great advantage to them and asking that the restrictions should be removed as far as Canada is concerned. Last summer, Mr. FISHER, Canadian Minister of Agriculture, made tremendous efforts in the same direction. He addressed a great many agricultural bodies, he wrote letters to newspapers and reviews, he laid down his case before the British authorities in the most convincing way — but all in vain.

On the 9th of October last, the Rt. Hon. Wm. HANBURY, President of the Board of Agriculture — a position equivalent to that of a minister — declared emphatically at Edinburgh that he would never yield to that demand " so long as he was Minister of Agriculture " (1).

---

(1) See Montreal *Star*, October 26th, 1901, and Montreal *Herald*, October 30th, 1901.

As a matter of fact, these regulations are nothing but a protective measure in favour of the wealthy stock-raisers of England. No Canadian could have any objection to the English breeders safeguarding their own interests, even at our expense; but it seems rather unfair that in order to conceal their real object, they should persist in branding our cattle, before the whole world, as a diseased cattle, whilst, in fact, it is practically free from a plague with which their own stocks are infected. This is especially ironical, at a time when one cannot open a British or a Canadian newspaper without being almost satiated with interminable talks of mutual love and reciprocal favours.

Coming across the Atlantic this summer, I met an English trader who told me, in presence of an English stock-raiser, that the cattle embargo was a fine thing for this compatriot of his, and others of the same class,— but, when he wanted to feel safe that he would not be poisoned, he made a point of asking his butcher for a piece of Canadian beef. His friend assented to the proposal but manifested no special anguish at the idea of his countrymen being poisoned by the meat of his over-fed cattle, nor at the harm done to his beloved Canadian kinsmen.

3° Alaska Boundary and Nicaragua Canal.

This is neither the time nor the place to discuss these two important questions. I will simply remind the reader that after having given so many tokens of friendship to our American neighbours during their war with Spain; having secured their consent to submit the Venezuela imbroglio to arbitration, their cooperation in China and their friendly neutrality in South Africa, — Great Britain has not made the slightest effort to have our own difficulty on the Alaska frontier settled either by mutual agreement or by judicial arbitration.

After the Anglo-American Commission had sat for six months and dissolved without any apparent result, one of the British Plenipotentiaries, Sir Louis DAVIES, Canadian Minister of Marine, naively admitted that he had to write " a big volume " in order to convince the British authorities that they should take our side of the controversy instead of helping the Americans against us (1). Such an announcement, coming at the very moment where we were protesting so loudly, both in words and in deeds, of our unbounded

(1) See Montreal *Herald*, October 31st, 1899.

love for Great Britain, must have deepened in the minds of the American statesmen the conviction that their refusal to comply with the most legitimate wishes of Canada would not entangle them in any serious difficulty with the British Government.

I need not say that the fruitful results of that big book of Sir Louis Davies are not yet conspicuous.

The *Empire Review* came out in November and December last with two most interesting and elaborate articles from the Hon. David MILLS, Canadian Minister of Justice, on "The Monroe Doctrine and the Interceanic Canal." Mr. Mills, whose authority on constitutional and international questions cannot be disputed, sets forth, in the most convincing way, the rights of Great Britain and the baseless pretensions of the United States. He says:

> The provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, in this regard, are vital to Canada, and the Government of the United Kingdom must not, for any political consideration, sacrifice the interests of Canada, and the future of the British Empire upon this continent... (Page 413.)

These articles were commented upon and highly praised by British Press. They had scarcely been spread over the Empire when the announcement came that the Government of the United Kingdom had sacrificed "the interests of Canada, and the future of the British Empire." Had the British press frankly admitted that Great Britain was forced to the abandonment of her rights in Nicaragua by her difficulties in South Africa, no objection could be raised — especially by Canada who did so much to encourage the Mother country in her foolish war policy and so little to help her in getting out of it by counseling peace in proper time. But instead of accepting, in a discreet and dignified way, the result of insuperable circumstances, the London papers have been bragging most grotesquely of this abandonment of British and Canadian rights.

These untimely rejoicings proved too much for some of our Canadian loyalists. On the 5th of December, the Ottawa *Citizen*, one of the leading organs of the Tory party, came out with a most sensible article on what its editor called: "*Ill timed Effusion*":

> The comments of the British Press on the Roosevelt message are calculated to give loyal Canadians a large, well-developed pain. Most of the newspapers, says the cable correspondent, "remark upon the tone of exultation adopted by the President in dealing with the Canal question," but for the most part the British press evince less concern over that than a desire to sycophantly applaud and be pleased at any cost with every thing that is said and even the way he says it... The idea that some *quid pro quo* for Canada in the shape of a settlement of the Alaskan boundary question might have been exacted as a slight return for the big concession on the Canal question is apparently furthest from their thoughts.

The article then goes on saying that as long as the people of Great Britain considered the United States as a still infant nation, they always spoke of them in a

patronising language calculated to rub any self-respecting people the wrong way... Now when that country has got wealthy and heady, instead of exercising a restraining influence by a firm diplomatic policy and an outspoken but friendly criticism on the part of its press, Great Britain grovels, admires and placates.

This article prompted a correspondence which appeared the following day and to which the *Citizen* gave the position of a leading article, without any comments or reservation on its part. The article is entitled: — "*Canada's position in the Empire*". It is, from top to bottom, a lecture to the beloved motherland, couched in a language the like of which, falling from my rebel lips, would have brought on my head the wrath and execration of all the standard bearers of loyalty — the *Citizen*, no doubt, among the first.

I risk the reproduction of a few paragraphs from that article:

...Many of our leading newspapers have been representing Britain as an indulgent mother, protecting us with her army, navy and great prestige, and Canada as a selfish and ungrateful dependent, accepting everything and contributing nothing towards the defence of the Empire.

The writers who thus slander their own country have profited little by their study of history. When and where, in the last eighty-seven years, has Britain protected us or championed our cause?

He then goes on with a list of the cases where Great Britain has sacrificed or bartered our interests for the sake of her own advantage. And he adds:

I assert unhesitatingly that in the settlement of every dispute between Britain and the United States, Canada has been the victim. Like Artemus Ward, who was willing to sacrifice all his wife's relations on the altar of his country, the imperial government has cheerfully sacrificed Canada's interests to maintain friendly relations with the United States.

Owing to our geographical position, Britain's army and navy could afford but slight, if any, protection to Canada... The only possible enemy that Canada need fear is our neighbour on this continent, the mighty republic. Against their aggressiveness British power and prestige have hitherto failed to protect us, and, if ever there was a possibility of such protection being granted in the past, it is rapidly diminishing if it has not already disappeared.

We are doing far more for Britain than Britain has done for Canada in nearly a century. While we are admitted to the markets of the United Kingdom on no better terms than the worst enemies of the Empire, we give British trade a substantial preference. While Britain has never, since the last war with the United States, taken a firm stand to protect us from the rapacity of our neighbours, Canadians have risked their lives, shed their blood and taxed themselves cheerfully to maintain the prestige of the Empire.

It is high time that Canadians became, not less loyal, but more patriotic. While we have no right to condemn the policy of the Imperial government, which has been dictated in the interest, or what has been regarded as the interest, of the Empire as a whole, we should look the fact squarely in the face — that in any clash of interests between the United States and the Dominion we need look for neither sympathy nor support from the imperial government. We will be expected to adhere to the traditional policy of Downing Street and sacrifice ourselves for the benefit of the Empire and the maintenance of cordial relations between England and the great American republic.

4°. British Emigration to the Colonies.

The following is a striking evidence of the indifference manifested by the British authorities towards the Colonies, whenever British interests are not at stake; — and also of the ridiculous submissive position which some Canadian statesmen and public organs think fit to take in presence of the supercilious attitude of their London masters.

In a letter written to the London *Times,* in September last, the Hon. G. W. ROSS, Prime Minister of Ontario, gave some striking figures showing that the bulk of British emigrants, for the last ten years, had gone to the United States: 520,000 out of 726,000 i. e. 72 per cent, as against 90,000 or 13 per cent, to British North America. He pointed out eloquently the advantages that the Empire would derive from the emigration to the British Colonies of the surplus population of the United Kingdom, and he suggested, as a means to this end, "the teaching of the geography and resources of the British Empire" (1). He added, as an inducement, that, with an increased population, —

> Canada would furnish a basis for the food supplies of the Empire, and an admirable recruiting ground from the Army and Navy. Moreover (and this is of great importance) with an addition to our population of such persons as would naturally emigrate from the United Kingdom, the attachment of Canadians to the Empire would be greatly and permanently strengthened.
>
> (*Times,* September 9th, 1901.)

I wonder if the last sentence intimated an apprehension of the reluctance which the French Canadians may have towards the new centralising policy of Great Britain? Any how, it seemed proper, even to such a strong Imperialist organ as the *Times,* to cool down Mr. Ross' patriotism. Commenting editorially upon this letter, it said, referring to the average British emigrant:

---

(1) It is noteworthy that this "teaching of geography" was also suggested to the British people by Sir Edwin COLLEN as a means of better appreciating what war material could be drawn from the colonies. (See chapter IV, page LXXI.)

Those who leave these shores for the United States are assuredly not all of the type or class described by Mr. Ross; probably an appreciable percentage are of a type and class which neither the United States nor the Dominion need greatly desire as citizens... The average emigrant is not the well educated, well-to-do artisan, "educated in our day schools at great expense, and trained in industrial methods in our technical schools and factories" —[words taken from Mr. Ross' letter]—... His going to the United States rather than to the Dominion, to South Africa, or to Australia is probably much less an affair of the flag than it is of latitude and longitude. South Africa is closed for the present, though we all hope that before long new openings and brighter prospects will be found there. Australian is a long way off, while the American Continent, is, by comparison, close at hand. Canada, as we know, is not "Our Lady of the Snows," but nothing can alter the fact that the United States lie south of the Dominion nor its influence on the stream of emigration. If Canada were a part of the United States, or if the British flag waved undisputed from the Arctic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico, the stream of european emigration would probably still flow mainly to the middle latitudes of the North American Continent. No improved "teaching of the geography and resources of the British Empire" can alter the fundamental fact that temperate zones best suit the people of these Islands.

(*Times*, September 11th, 1901.)

It will be noticed that among the three great groups of self-governing Colonies, Canada is pointed out as the least suited to British emigrants. As far as South Africa is concerned, the only inconveniences found are those arising from the accidental conditions of war; and as for Australasia, distance seems to be the only obstacle; —but Canada is described as not having the advantage of lying in a "temperate zone"!

But if there is indifference in British official spheres as far as emigration to Canada is concerned, there is more earnestness in favour of emigration to South Africa — for the excellent reason that there are British political interests to be served in that region.

On the 2nd of July last, the Toronto *Globe* published the following special despatch from Ottawa:

Advices received from England intimate that the consent of the Imperial Government has been given to a scheme for State-aided emigration to South Africa. This news will be received with much regret in Canada and the other Colonies which are looking to the British Isles for settlers to occupy and till their vacant lands. After the sacrifices which the Colonies have made in blood and treasure to help the Mother country, it seems but a poor return for the latter to throw its mighty influence into the scale in favour of emigration to South Africa. Canada has special reason to feel annoyance.

This "regret" of the *Globe* did not prevent it from paying its courtesies to the Mother country very soon after the announcement of this "poor return" for our sacrifices.

In a leading article, commenting upon the speeches made at the

Dominion Day Dinner in London (1), the *Globe* said, on the 20th of July 1901:

Mr. Chamberlain evidently realises the magnitude of the question of Imperial unity, and is not willing to see the high ideal aimed at wrecked by haste or over-zealousness... It is recognised that the movement towards unity must be spontaneous on the part of the Colonies... The creation of a definite corporate union of autonomous parts, acting from a common centre, presents difficulties so great that it is perhaps unwise at the present time even to regard it as desirable. This, however, if ever accomplished, must be the last step in Imperial unity rather than the first. The first, or among the first, as we have said on previous occasions, is the devising of some scheme of Imperial defence wherein the great colonies will begin to bear some share of the heavy burden which hitherto has fallen upon the Mother country alone. Once this all important step is taken, we shall approach the parent country on more equal terms in all subsequent negotiations for closer union.

This is indeed ideal Imperialism: first, we supply England with soldiers and war taxes; and then.... we will see later on. In the meanwhile, whenever the British Government descriminates against Canada, we express respectful "regrets"; but we assure them right away of our readiness to stand it again as long as they like.

5°. Colonial Representation.

This question held a considerable place — as shown in the first chapter of these documents — in the discussions of the Jubilee Conference as well as in the speeches and the declarations of the Colonial Premiers present at the Jubilee festivities. It came only once in four years before the Parliament at Westminster.

On the 3rd of April 1900, Mr. HEDDERWICK, M. P., made the following motion:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable in the interests of the Empire, that the Colonies should be admitted to some direct representation in the Imperial Parliament. (P. D., Vol. 81, page 1144.)

Mr. Hedderwick made a short review of the development of the Imperial idea. He spoke eloquently of the part taken by the Colonies in the South African war, adding:

But if it were thought desirable to turn what is a mere voluntary contribution into a certain and fixed quota, how could that be accomplished without admitting the Colonies to our councils, and giving them a voice in the determination of Imperial policy?... (Page 1136.)

---

(1) See page CXXIII

He quoted in this respect the opinion and the speeches of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the Canadian Parliament, saying:

For what is it that Sir Wilfrid Laurier claims? It is the right, as the Premier of a colony, to sit in judgment upon the Imperial Parliament, and to approve or disapprove, to assist or not assist in our decisions. I cannot help thinking that on this occasion of the Transvaal war it was fortunate that the judgment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in our favour... (Page 1138.)

The motion was seconded by Mr. TREVELYAN, who said:

...Of course the loyalty of the colonies and their action at the present time shows their intense affection for the Mother country, but that loyalty has not been entirely unquestioning, although it has been given as graciously as it could be given... The suggestion I am going to make is not my own, or I should not venture to make it. It comes from a colonial source. It is that the Agents General or some other people in thoroughly responsible or representative positions should be allowed, not to have voting power, for it would be ridiculous to suggest voting power — it would mean so little — but that they or some others in a representative capacity should be allowed to have a voice in our discussions (1)... (Pages 1142 and 1143.)

The Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, opposed the motion — though he declared himself in full sympathy with its object which was "to induce a closer union between the Colonies and the Mother country." But he stated that the motion was not capable of actual application and led only to a useless "academic discussion." He said very sensibly that the Colonies would not accept such inadequate representation as suggested by Mr. Trevelyan. As to the participation of the Colonies in British wars, he said:

I believe that if in any stress, or difficulty, or crisis of our fate, we did make a call on the Colonies, their efforts would be immensely greater even than those they have already made... (Page 1144.)

He acknowledged the right of representation which the Colonies would acquire by such contributions but he stated that this right had not yet been asserted by the Colonies. He therefore rejected the proposition as premature.

Mr. HEDDERWICK withdrew his motion.

---

(1) See speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier before the Colonial Party, July, 1897, chapter I. (Page XVIII.)

VII

Development of Imperialism in Canada.

1°. Congresses of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire.

The following notes and extracts are all taken from the official reports of the Congresses. The report of the Second Congress, 1892, was published on the 14th of July of that year as a supplement to the *Chamber of Commerce Journal*. The two others were published in special pamphlet form by the London Chamber of Commerce.

SECOND CONGRESS, 1892.

At this Congress, held in London in June and July, Sir Charles TUPPER, then High Commissioner for Canada in Great Britain, vainly endeavoured to bring the Congress to the adoption of a motion in favour of an Imperial Preferential tariff. His proposition was defeated by a vote of 58 against 33; but the principle of a commercial union of the Empire, based on free trade, was set down. Nothing was done in the way of military or political Imperialism.

THIRD CONGRESS, 1896.

This Congress was opened on the 9th of June by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN who reiterated the idea of a commercial union of the Empire. He added:

> If we had a commercial union throughout the Empire, of course there would have to be a Council of the Empire, and that Council would be called upon to watch over the execution of the arrangements which might be made, to consider and to make amendments in them from time to time; and whenever such a Council is established, surely there will naturally be remitted to it all these questions of communication and of commercial law in which all parts of the Empire are mutually interested. Even Imperial Defence could not be excluded from its deliberations, for Imperial Defence is only another name for the protection of Imperial Commerce. To such a

Council as I have imagined to be possible, the details of such defence, the method of carrying it out, the provision to be made for it, would naturally be remitted. Gradually, therefore, by that prudent and experimental process by which all our greatest institutions have slowly been built up, we should in this way, I believe, approach to a result which would be little if at all distinguished from a real Federation of the Empire. (Page 4.)

The motion in favour of commercial union was made by Mr. OSLER, President of the Toronto Board of Trade, and practically supported by an amendment of Sir Donald SMITH (now Lord Strathcona), who had succeeded Sir Charles Tupper in the High Commissioner's office. These propositions were strongly opposed by the British Delegates, and especially by Mr. Sydney BUXTON, M. P., late Under Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Canadian delegates vainly appealed to sentiment: they were told plainly by their British colleagues that if the colonists wanted a closer union with the Mother country, they should not ask from her any sacrifice in favour of colonial trade. The result was still worse than in 1892. The motions of Mr. Osler and Sir Donald Smith had both to be withdrawn, and the following resolution moved by Mr. LOCKHART, delegate from the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce, was adopted:

That in the opinion of this Congress it is the duty of the Government to take immediate steps for the attainment of a closer political and commercial union between the Mother country and the Colonies; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for the Colonies. (Page 38.)

It will be noted that, this time, the word "political" was inserted.

Mr. G. TONKS, delegate of the Birmingham Chamber, moved:

That as a first step towards Imperial Federation it is desirable that a Consultative Imperial Council should be formed, whose members for the time being should be resident in England. That the Council should be called together in cases where the interest of the colonies represented were affected in matters of Trade, Finance or Imperial Defence. That this Council should consist of members elected by every self-governing colony in some adequate and relative proportion to its electorate, and that its functions should be purely consultative. That the Crown colonies should also be represented on this Council. (Page 45.)

This motion was adopted unanimously.

There was no further step on the question of Imperial Defence.

FOURTH CONGRESS, 1900.

At this Congress, opened in London on the 26th of June, the inaugural address was delivered by the Earl of SELBORNE, Under Secretary of State for the Colonies. He insisted mainly on the question of Imperial Defence, —

— which, said he, on glancing at your agenda, seems to me to be that which is attracting the most attention this year.

Gentlemen, that is a very old question in a new form. The whirligig of time has indeed presented us with a strange inversion. A century and a quarter ago it was this question of Imperial Defence which lay the root of that quarrel with our American colonies, which finally lost them to us. To-day it is the same question which is operating more than any other to draw the different parts of the Empire together. Then the Imperial Government stated a fact, which I hold to be indisputable, that it was the business of the colonies to contribute to their own defence. Now that fact is admitted, without any pressure on the part of the Imperial Government, by the Colonies concerned. Then the Imperial Government endeavoured to force the method of contribution on the colonies, which colonies held that they had not been properly consulted, and were not being dealt with in a constitutional manner. To-day it is the Colonies that come forward and give of their best to the Imperial Government when the Imperial Government has need of it. That question, which a century and a quarter ago seemed likely to destroy the British Empire, is the question of all others to-day which is going to consolidate it... Therefore, while it would, I think, be a great mistake of statesmanship to attempt to ask the Colonies to do that which they are not in a position to do, because the conditions and the circumstances of each colony are so conflicting, the particular conditions of a future struggle are so unknown it is impossible to lay down exact rules as to the assistance which this or that colony may be prepared to give. But what, I think, the colonies may do, and what I would suggest that the Chambers of Commerce in the different parts of the Empire, should assist in doing, is to urge those colonies not only to complete the preparations for defence of their own shores and their own territories in case of an emergency, but to take stock of the material they possess, from which, if they so desire it in time of emergency, they may proffer help to the Mother country...

(*Official Report*, 4th Congress, pages 6 and 7.)

The first question put before the Congress was that of the Imperial Council. It was moved by Mr. TONKS, of Birmingham, in the following terms:

That the increasing cordiality and sense of union between England and her Colonies, renders practicable the proposal for the formation of a Consultative Council of Representatives to deal with the colonial questions, a Resolution on which subject was unanimously adopted at the last Congress of Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, and that the matter be brought under the notice of Her Majesty's Government. (Page 9.)

In the course of his remarks, Mr. TONKS said:

It might be better in this matter of the Imperial Council, to begin with

consultation with the idea that we might end with Federation... this great Council would meet together on some friendly basis, and though at first purely of a consultative character, would no doubt pave the way for the Federation which is so much desired. To proceed step by step is probably the wiser course... (Pages 8 and 9.)

This " wiser course " was too slow for the colonists, anxious as they were to throw themselves in the great Empire. Mr. G. H. DUNN, delegate of the Chamber of Commerce of Cape Town, moved:

That the time has arrived when a serious effort should be made to formulate a scheme of Imperial Federation, whereby the self-governing Colonies shall be represented in the Councils of the Empire; — That as a means to this end, all the self-governing Colonies should contribute a percentage — to be decided by their representatives in Conference —

— not even by their Parliaments! —

— of their annual revenue to the cost of Imperial Defence; — That representation in any Federal Council should be in proportion to the respective contributions of the several States; — That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to Lord Salisbury and the Premiers of the self-governing Colonies for their consideration. (Page 11.)

Of course, it was in order that this motion should be seconded by a " loyal " Canadian. It fell to Mr. Thomas McFARLANE, representative of the Ottawa Board of Trade, and moreover, an official of the Canadian Government, to perform that duty. In his homily, this staunch Imperialist quoted the speech delivered by Lord Salisbury, at a banquet of the British Empire League, on the 30th of April 1900. In this speech, an extract of which appears in chapter III (1), thePrime Minister of England had advised the Imperialists not to go too fast in their work. Mr. McFarlane denounced this policy of procrastination, and urged the British authorities to come back to Lord Beaconfield's colonial policy of centralisation and Downing-Street domination.

Senator G. A. DRUMMOND, representative of the Montreal Board of Trade, came to the rescue. He declared that Mr. Tonks' motion did not go far enough; that the colonists, the Canadians especially,

...who sent their sons to Africa were not influenced by any such milk-and-water sentiment as "increased cordiality and sense of union"... I think that the time is coming when England will recognise that she must bind her Colonies to her as an integral part of the Empire, and that no description such as this, of a sense of union, will be allowed to take root for one moment. (Page 12.)

---

(1) See page L.

It was hard work for the British delegates to cool down the ardour of these enthusiastic colonists. Lord AVEBURY, delegate of the Association of Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom and of the London Chamber, observed that:

> In voting for the original Resolution, we desire it to be understood that we so vote because we believe that the Resolution of the Birmingham Chamber will carry us as far as we are prepared to go. Many of us, in supporting what is proposed by the Birmingham Chamber to-day, believe that the time is not far distant when we shall see carried what is suggested by the Cape Town Chamber. (Page 12.)

At last, an understanding was reached on the following resolution which Mr. TONKS substituted to his original motion:

> That the feeling of Imperial citizenship throughout the Empire, and the sense of union already attained between the Mother country and her colonies render practicable and advisable the formation, at an early date, of an Imperial and Consultative Council of representatives, in which the motherland and her colonies shall have due representation *to deal with* colonial and Imperial questions, and that the matter be brought under the notice of Her Majesty's Government. (Page 14.)

This motion was seconded by Mr. McLEOD, delegate of the Board of Trade of Fredericton, N. B., Canada.

A delegate made the following observation:

> I think you will not allow the words "to deal" with colonial questions to be included; you are making the Consultative Council also an executive Council. (Page 14.)

It was then suggested that the words "consider and advise" should be substituted to "deal with". The Canadian delegate refused at first to accept the amendment; but the English delegates checked his zeal, and the resolution was finally carried unanimously as amended.

The motion in favour of inter-imperial trade was made by Mr. KEMP, delegate of the Toronto Board of Trade, now representing one of the Toronto electoral divisions in the House of Commons of Canada. It was fought by most of the British delegates. The patriotic colonials vainly pointed out the sacrifices made by the Colonies in favour of Great Britain during the South African war, and asserted that they were ready to help the motherland at any time. The Canadian delegates insisted also on the good will of Canada as shown in the preferential reduction of duties granted to British imports. None of these sentimental arguments moved the stern Scotch and English representatives. Mr. THOMPSON, delegate of the Manchester Chamber, speaking of the Colonies said:

Their trade is of great value to us, but we esteem their friendship even more highly than their trade. The events of the past year have brought home to every Englishman the immense moral and material support which our colonial kinsmen can and do render to the Mother country in the defence of the Empire. This is far better than any mere community of interests, it is emphatically a union of hearts... (Page 21.)

Mr. ANDERSON, delegate of the Edinburgh Chamber, summed up the situation in a very few words, and told plainly to the colonists:

SENTIMENT IS ONE THING AND BUSINESS IS ANOTHER. (Page 26.)

Finally the Canadian delegates had to withdraw their motion and to accept a compromised resolution which read as follows:

That this Congress urges upon Her Majesty's Government the appointment by them of a Royal Commission, composed of Representatives of Great Britain and her colonies and India, to consider the possibilities of increasing and strengthning the trade relations between the different portions of the Empire, and that the Chairman nominate a representative deputation to wait upon the Premier, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the President of the Board of Trade and lay the question fully before them. (Page 43.)

When the delegation tried to accomplish their mission, Lord Salisbury refused to receive them; and Mr. Chamberlain told them plainly that in the present state of mind of the British public, it was perfectly useless to push the matter any further.

The question of Imperial defence was brought by Mr. HADRILL, delegate of the Montreal Board of Trade. His motion read as follows:

Whereas, in the opinion of this Congress the time has arrived when Great Britain, her Colonies and Dependencies, should take united action for the all desirable adoption of measures conducive to the strength, progress, and permanent solidarity of the Empire, and

Whereas it is generally recognised that the colonies should contribute towards the cost of the naval and military defence of the Empire, and further, that an advantageous commercial bond is one of the strongest links in national unity, and that the maintenance and strengthening of trade is the key-stone of a nation's successful development;

Therefore be it resolved — That in the opinion of this Congress the bonds of the British Empire would be materially strengthened, and the union of the various parts of Her Majesty's Dominions greatly consolidated by the Colonies contributing towards the naval and military defence of the Empire;

Be it further resolved —

That in order to make the foregoing operative, the Chair shall appoint, before this Congress dissolves, a representative and proportionate Committee of Home and Colonial delegates to devise a scheme based upon the above Resolutions, and to report to this Congress, and that a copy of these resolutions be officially forwarded to the Home Government, and to the Governments of the Colonies and Dependencies. (Page 45.)

The motion was seconded by Mr. McFARLANE, delegate of the Ottawa Board of Trade. This inflamed patriot would have preferred the wording of the resolution to be stronger. He said:

It is not our business certainly to have anything to do, and perhaps very little to say, with military affairs and their conduct—the military defence of the Empire or the naval defence of the Empire; but I think what we civilians have to do is to provide money in abundance for the purpose... However much the colonies may have done in South Africa, England bears by far the largest share of the cost. We want, if possible, to have this thing properly arranged... You must in some way or another tax the colonies in an equitable way, and in such a way as will be just to the Colonies and to the Mother country itself. We believe in Canada that the best manner, the most equitable way in which that money can be raised for the defence of the Empire, is by placing a small *ad valorem* duty on all imports coming into the Empire from foreign countries... (Page 45.)

M. L. E. GEOFFRION of the Chamber of Commerce of Montreal, spoke as follows:

In the name of the Montreal Chamber of Commerce, whilst approving all of what has been said regarding closer commercial relations with the Mother country, I would like to say if Canada takes part in the defence of the Empire she should be moved by a more elevated sentiment, prompted by circumstances of urgency, right, justice, and reasoned gratitude, but without any written law. Without written law is the manner in which the Canadians, the French Canadians, have always shown their loyalty, especially recently by their contribution, with the considerable expense implied, of a force of over 3,000 men enlisted to fight the battles of the British Empire in South Africa, with the glorious but still bloody results known. Since those acts of devotion have taken place without being prescribed in our Constitution, and Canada understands her natural obligations as regards the defence of her territory, and since the nation, through its representatives, has chosen to assert that its recent assistance beyond the frontier was complimentary and not obligatory, and that it did not constitute a precedent; considering on the other hand, that our Sovereign attributed the same value to this act, and was satisfied therewith, our Chamber, for all the reasons given, does not feel disposed to adopt the principle of the propositions submitted. (Page 46.)

It will be noted that this argument was almost a verbatim repetition of the argument used by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the House of Commons of Canada,— and reasserted throughout the Province of Quebec by his colleagues and followers — to prove that my action with regard to Canada's contribution in the war was useless, and that our country was not pledged to any future participation in British wars.

Mr. Geoffrion then offered the following amendment:

That the Colonies be not asked to contribute to the defence of the Empire unless they do so willingly, and without coercion or written law.

In this Congress, representing the trade, industry, and finances of the whole Empire, there was found no man imbued enough with the true traditions of British self-government to support this expression of common sense. Mr. Geoffrion's motion could not be put by the Chair, and Mr. Hadrill's motion and Mr. McFarlane's platitudes were ratified unanimously, with the dissenting voice of Mr. Geoffrion.

I need not say that no protest came from the British delegates: this time, it was not merely " sentiment," but good " business " for them.

The Colonists evidently bore no grudge against their British colleagues for all the rebukes they had received at their hands.

At the banquet by which the Congress was closed on the 29th of June 1900, Mr. Thomas F. BLACKWELL, Chairman of the Council of the London Chamber of Commerce, said:

...I think that we, as a nation, must feel proud of those efforts that our colonies have made, and it must give us the assurance that in the future we shall know where to look for our soldiers, not only in this United Kingdom, but in that greater Empire of which we are so proud. I feel sure, from the patriotic spirit that has been shown, not only in the hour of victory, but in the hour of misfortune... that our Queen has only to call upon her subjects throughout the world, to have that same ready response, and to find that we can gather our soldiers from every quarter of the globe. (Page 84.)

Captain Arthur M. MYERS, from Auckland, New Zealand, said, speaking of Colonial help in the South African war:

...We certainly felt it was an opportune time to show to the world that the display at Her Majesty's Jubilee was not an idle display — that we meant business. When the opportunity came, we thought, therefore, it was a privilege to be able to say that we appreciated the honour of fighting side by side with the Imperial Forces, and endeavouring to participate in their glorious traditions... (Page 85.)

Mr. KEMP, of Toronto, said:

...One of the questions which has been discussed in the Congress was with reference to an Imperial Council;... and I hope that this Imperial Council will be organised soon, and that year in and year out the voices of the different parts of the Empire may be heard in London, — heard in order that Great Britain may be in touch with all parts... A good deal has been said about contributing to the Imperial defences, and I can assure you, my Lord, —[referring to Lord Selborne, Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies]— that it is the desire of the Canadian people, as far as politics will admit of it, and as far as we can educate the people to it, to do our fair share... (Page 91.)

The Hon. James BALFOUR, from Melbourne, Victoria, said:

...We have to see that no other flag but the British flag shall float over South Africa. We wish to assist the Mother country and be always ready to come to her assistance. (Page 92.)

Sir Michael HICKS-BEACH was quite right in saying (1) that this Congress was still more remarkable than the contribution of the colonies to the South-African war.

It is the truest expression of what Imperialism means: plenty of sentiment, of devotion, of war contributions, on the part of the Colonies;— strict adherence to self-interest on the part of Great Britain.

The progress of this idea is easily detected through the deliberations of those three Congresses.

In 1892, the principle of commercial union was laid down — more or less.

In 1896, it was "commercial and political union";—and, as a consequence, the organisation of a "purely consultative" Imperial Council.

In 1900, commercial union is decidedly thrown aside. The establishment of an Imperial Council is strongly urged, "to begin with consultation with the idea of ending with Federation." But the defence of the Empire becomes the main question, and the principle of a *forced* contribution from the Colonies to the war budget of Great Britain is proclaimed by the Colonial delegates themselves.

That idea has since been taken up by Lt. Col. DENISON, President of the Canadian Branch of the British Empire League, in a leaflet which was sent broadcast throughout Canada. His suggestion was that we should raise a five per cent duty on all our imports and devote the proceeds to the defence of the Empire. In the fiscal year previous to the last, our contribution would have amounted to over $6,000,000.

2°. The "British Empire League" in Canada.

MEETING OF 1900.

The League held its annual meeting at Ottawa on the 14th of March 1900. Lieut. Col. G. T. Denison, the President, was in the Chair. Amongst those present were Sir Charles Tupper, Hon. David Mills, Hon. W. S. Fielding, Sir Louis Davies, Hon. Wm. Mulock, Hon. R. R. Dobell, Sir MacKenzie Bowell, and a great many others including several members of Parliament and Senators.

---

(1) Speech at Liverpool, 24 October 1900 (Page XLIX.)

The annual report presented by the President ended as follows:

This war and the community of feeling and action which it has thus brought forth must pave the way for further steps in the direction of consolidating and strengthening the Empire, not only for defence but in every other way in which, by increased trade and mutual advantages, every part may be assisted and strengthened to be a help and support to every other... In order that Canada may be better prepared to meet her obligations in case of need, your Committee would express the hope that the Government will at once take steps to improve the military forces of this country, not only in numbers, but in equipment, drill and organisation, so that in case of need we may be prepared to do our full share in defending the interests of that Empire under whose flag we enjoy a safety and confidence that we could not have under other conditions... (Page 163.)

In presenting that report and moving its adoption, Col. DENISON said:

...In order to occupy our proper position in the Empire, in order that we may be able to do our share in defending its interests, our military forces should be put into the best possible conditions, and we should provide ourselves with a sufficiency of arms and equipments of all kinds... (Page 164.)

The great object that we, as a League, should work for is to do all that we can to urge the improvement of our defences and the aiding of the navy by a reserve of trained seamen. We should urge the calling of another Imperial conference to arrange the terms of the assistance that we ought mutually to give, and the best method of raising the revenue required for it. The men we Canadians have sent to South Africa are helping to bind the Empire together, and they are rendering services to the cause of Imperialism that will not be forgotten... (Page 165.)

The Hon. Wm. MULOCK seconded the report. After endorsing the patriotic sentiments expressed by the Chairman..... Mr. Mulock touched on the war and proceeded:

...Where is the Manchester school to-day? Where are the Little Englanders to-day? They are as extinct as the dodo almost. To-day the question has ceased to divide the people of the Empire, and to-day the British people in all parts of the world have, I submit, pre-eminently passed upon it as the national creed of the country, the national unity of the Empire. That is the essential part of the creed of the people of Canada, the creed, the dominant portion of the creed, of every part of this country, and if, therefore, we can as an Association give any help practically to give effect to that creed, to promote step by step the unification of the people by uniting them in interest and in sentiment, whether it be as we move on in that line, attaining the ultimate goal of this association and of the British people throughout the world, the complete union, the complete federation, of the British Empire... (Page 166.)

The Hon. R.-R. DOBELL warmly endorsed all that had fallen from the previous speakers concerning the importance of the objects of the League, and particularly as to the value of the Pacific Cable. He looked forward to the further development of the principle of representation as the solution

of the Imperial questions. Little Englanders, said Mr. Dobell, are as extinct as the dodo, but there is another bird, of which there are ten left in Canada. (Page 166.)

This was an allusion to the ten members who had voted in the House, the day previous, to declare that the future of Canada was not pledged by the sending of troops to South Africa. Mr. Dobell was himself one of the thirteen ministers who asserted the same principle on the 13th of October 1899 and denied it on the 13th of March 1900. (1)

Sir Charles TUPPER, after referring to the recent work done by Dr. Parkin in the cause of Imperial federation, and to the great unifying influence throughout the Empire which the ultimatum of President Kruger had given rise to, went on to speak as follows:

No person who listened to the most brilliant and eloquent address —[from Sir Wilfrid Laurier]— that we in the House of Commons of Canada listened to last night, can fail to appreciate the tremendous impulse that the South African war has given to this great vital question of the unity of the Empire. That address was cheered not only by the ordinary supporters of the Prime Minister of Canada, but it was cheered with equal enthusiasm by, I might say, all in the House of Commons... (Page 167.)

Sir MacKENZIE BOWELL moved a resolution favouring the establishment of a naval reserve in Canada. In supporting the resolution he expressed his gratification at the unanimity of feeling that existed, not only at this meeting but throughout the Dominion at the present time, particularly upon the great question which is agitating and threatening the Empire to which we belong. He warmly advocated the formation of a naval reserve in Canada... (Page 167.)

Principal GRANT seconded the motion.

Sir Louis DAVIES... spoke of his warm interest in the work of the League. He commended the policy of not depending on written constitutions and programmes. The federation of the Empire was already taking place all over the world...

The resolution had in view the training of the naval men of Canada so as to be of use to the British Navy when called on. Great Britain must provide in the future as in the past the greatest navy in the world — equal to the navy not of one, but of any combination of powers. That navy would be our defence. We could not supply ships to that navy with a limitation like that of the Australian Colonies, that such ships could only be used for the defence of Canada's shores, but he believed it possible to work out a scheme whereby the great fishing population of both coasts of Canada could be so trained as to efficiently support the British Navy, ready to take their place in defence of the Empire on board of Great Britain's ships. He did not mean to say that a scheme had been framed, but informal negotiations had been going forward. He had had the honour of discussing it with Mr. Goschen, and matters had progressed fairly well... (Page 168.)

---

(1) See Chapter II, pages XXXV and XXXVIII.

The following officers were elected:

President.— Lieut. Col. G.-T. Denison.
Vice-Presidents.— Ontario, Sir Oliver Mowat, Sir MacKenzie Bowell, Mr. Alex. McNeill, M. P.; Quebec: Lord Strathcona, Hon. J.-Israel Tarte, Mr. A. McGoun; Nova Scotia: Sir M. Daly, Archbishop O'Brien; New Brunswick: Senator Wood, Dr. Weldon; Prince Edward Island: former Lieut. Governor Howland; Manitoba: Hon. J.-C. Patterson; North West Territories: Hon. C.-H. MacKintosh; British Columbia: Hewitt Bostock, M. P.

(*The British Empire Review*, Vol. I, n° 10; — April 1900.)

MEETING OF 1901.

The Meeting of 1901 was held at Ottawa on Wednesday, February 13th. Lt. Col. George T. Denison, President, occupied the chair, and among those present were several Ministers of the Crown, Senators and Members of the House. The Hon. George W. ROSS, Prime Minister of Ontario, not being able to attend, sent his regrets in a letter which ended as follows:

Hoping the meeting may be a success, and a means of strengthening our relations with the Empire, as well as strengthening the influence of the League itself, which has already done such good work, etc. (Page 180.)

The annual report, dated January 26th 1901, contained the following paragraphs:

Your Committee consider that an Imperial Consultative Council should be established, and that immediate steps should be taken to thoroughly organise and combine the military and naval defensive power of the Empire. Preparatory to this being done, your Committee would urge upon the Canadian Government and Parliament to at once re-organise the Militia force of Canada upon broader lines, and in accordance with the spirit of modern warfare, as shown by the late experiences with improved weapons in the operations in South Africa. We have seen the whole Empire coming to the assistance of one part. No one part can tell where the next blow may be struck, and it is the interest of each part to be completely ready to do its full share in the common defence, in order that it may fairly claim assistance in the hour of need. This much, whether with an Imperial Conference or without one, is the manifest duty and interest of the Canadian people.

Your Committee have repeatedly urged the importance of forming a Royal Naval Reserve in Canada. At the annual meeting of this League two years ago, Sir Louis DAVIES expressed the intention of the Government to take steps to form such a reserve. Your Committee, therefore, feel confident that this branch of the national defence will soon be organised on an efficient footing. (Page 179.)

In moving the adoption of the report, the PRESIDENT said:

The war in South Africa, we may hope, will soon be concluded, and we may look about us and estimate the effect of the movement of the great self-governing colonies in aiding the Mother country to defend Imperial

interests. The assistance may not proportionately have been very large, but it has shown for the first time the awakening of the great colonies to a sense of the duty they owe to the Mother country and to each other. The step that has been taken cannot be retraced, and the whole question of the relative duties and responsibilities of each part of the Empire must, sooner or later, be discussed and agreed upon...

In our League we have advocated an Imperial Conference, both by resolution and in the annual report. We think one should be called in England this year. The time is opportune. The Empire is full of the Imperial idea...

The military forces in every colony should be put upon an effective footing, both in men, arms, munitions and factories for the manufacture of weapons. Each colony should agree to furnish its quota in case of need in just proportion, which could be easily agreed upon. In the meantime, here in Canada we should thoroughly and effectively organise and equip our forces, and should undertake to maintain and garrison Halifax, Esquimalt, Quebec, etc., in proper strength, so as to enable us promptly to furnish our first call in case of war. (Applause)... (Pages 180-1.)

The motion for the adoption of the report was seconded by Sir Charles Hibbert TUPPER and adopted.

An Imperial Conference.

Sir Charles Hibbert TUPPER moved:

That this League being in favour of the formation of an Imperial Consultative Council, urges strongly upon our Government and upon the League in England, that an Imperial Conference be called in London at an early date to consider the establishment of such a Council, and to consider also the question of Imperial defence, Imperial preferential trade, Imperial cables, a uniform insolvency law, and such other subjects as may be agreed upon. (Page 182.)

Dr. Benjamin RUSSELL, M. P., said he could not subscribe to all the sentiments uttered by the President, in moving the adoption of the address, but fortunately the resolution did not commit them to an endorsation of Col. Denison's view in regard to difficult and delicate questions. He therefore gladly seconded the resolution... It was astonishing with what rapidity the country was coming around to the adoption of views which but a few short years ago were propounded by half-a-dozen men, who were considered lunatics... (Page 182.)

The motion was agreed to.

Royal Naval Reserve.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN, M. P., the Opposition Leader, moved a resolution in favour of the formation of a Royal Naval Reserve amongst our seafaring men.

He said there were in the maritime Provinces as fine a body of seafaring men as could be found in the world. If organised, as effective a body of naval militia could be obtained as Canada already possessed in its land forces... (Page 182.)

Mr. Aulay MORRISON, M. P., seconded and strongly endorsed the motion which was carried unanimously.

Position of Quebec.

Mr. Frederic D. MONK, the Opposition Leader from Quebec, said that this was the first meeting of the League he had attended.

Its report would be carefully scanned by himself and by the people of Quebec. The Province of Quebec would not stand aloof from the great questions which were now being examined. They realised that there were a great many things to be improved on in the relations between the Dominion and the Mother country... He hoped the first resolution would be carried out, because there was no place where these relations could be examined better than in the Metropolis. He was also in sympathy with the other resolutions. Quebec had special rights to preserve, and was anxious that they should be maintained but she was also anxious, and had given proof of her anxiety, to do her best for the development of this country and this great Empire. (Page 183.)

The following officers were elected for the ensuing year:

President, Lt. Col. G.-T. Denison, Toronto, (re-elected); Vice-Presidents for Ontario, Sir Oliver Mowat, Sir MacKenzie Bowell, Alex. McNeill; — for Quebec, Lord Strathcona and Mount-Royal, Hon. J.-I. Tarte, Arch. McGoun; — for New Brunswick, Senator Wood and R.-C. Weldon, K. C.; — for Nova Scotia, Lt. Gov. Jones and Archbishop O'Brien;—for Prince Edward Island, Hon. W. Howland; — Manitoba, Hon. J.-C. Patterson; — North West Territories, Hon. C.-H. MacIntosh; — British Columbia, Lt. Gov. Joly...

Messrs Borden, Monk, Kemp, Brock, Barker and all other members of Parliament, not already on the Executive Committee, were added to that body.....

(*The British Empire Review*, Vol. II, n° 9, March 1901.)

3°. A Few Witnesses.

BANK OF OTTAWA.

At the meeting of the shareholders of the Bank of Ottawa, on the 13th of December 1899, Mr. J. G. WHYTE, in seconding the adoption of the annual report, said:

...It occurs to me that the advantages received from the connection with the Mother country are not sufficiently appreciated. The very prosperity of the Bank, as exemplified in the report we are considering, and the security for life and property enjoyed by the people of this country, is largely due to the protection afforded by the Army and Navy of Great Britain and towards the maintenance of which Canada contributes nothing. The feeling is growing throughout the Dominion that the time has come for some amendment to the articles of co-partnership and that we should cease to

occupy the undesirable position of taking all and giving nothing. It is true, we have, recently, voluntarily, sent a thousand of our bravest and best young men, to assist in maintaining the rights of British subjects in South Africa, and from present appearances the second contingent offered will likely be accepted, but that is not enough. The country can afford, in addition to making greater provisions for the defence of the different provinces, to follow the lead of Australia and Cape Colony and make a direct annual contribution to the cost of supporting the British Navy... (Ottawa *Free Press,* December 14th, 1899.)

LORD STRATHCONA.

In December 1900, Lord STRATHCONA was installed as Lord Rector of Aberdeen University. In his inaugurated address, he spoke at length of the Imperialistic movement, the South African war, and Canada's devotion to the Empire. He said, among other things:

I believe that one of the results of the war will be to bring much nearer the consolidation and unity of the Empire...

There are some who think that the solution of the problem is to be found in the representation of Canada and the colonies in the Imperial Parliament. I am not one of those who share that view, at any rate until a truly Imperial Parliament to deal with Imperial Affairs can be established... That may be the ultimate solution or it may not. But, in the meantime, the constitution of an Imperial Council, in conjunction with the Colonial Office, consisting of representatives of Her Majesty's Government, and of Canada and the Colonies, has been mentioned as a preliminary step, even if the Council were only consultative at the commencement.

No doubt, Lord Strathcona considers that he is well able to perform the duties of representation for Canada in England. With all due respect to the noble Lord, should Canada accept to be thus represented by a single individual, having no direct responsibility to the people, it would be time to ask what has become of the good old British traditions of *"No taxation without representation,"* and of *"Government of the people by the people?"*

He then spoke of the defence of the Empire and proved that Canada had already contributed largely, though indirectly, to the military organisation of the Empire; and he added:

I do not mean to say that the Colonies ought not to pay towards the cost of the Army and the Navy. No such proposal has yet been made to them; but I am sure that, if put forward, it will be taken into serious consideration. As to the Navy, much more co-operation is possible. Up to the present time, or at any rate until quite recently, the large seafaring populations in the United Kingdom and in the Colonies have not been utilised to any appreciable extent for the formation of a trained naval reserve. A beginning has been made in Newfoundland, and may be extended. Speaking of my own country, no better material could be found than among the 70,000 hardy sailors and fishermen who inhabit the long cost lines of the Dominion.
(Montreal *Herald,* January 5th, 1901.)

HON. G. W. ROSS, PRIME MINISTER OF ONTARIO.

From the old Canadian Liberal that he was, the leader of the Ontario Goverment has become one of the most zealous apostles of Mr. Chamberlain's gospel. Mr. ROSS was last summer in England and did not fail to sing the right tune in the concert of which the Colonial Secretary is the chief director.

At a meeting of the British Empire League, held in London Mr. Ross was reported as having expressed himself in these terms:

The Hon. G.-W. ROSS said the British Empire League served the great purpose of diffusing through the Empire a sentiment of autonomy and unity that made the remotest extremities of the Empire feel that they were vitally connected with its center. Canada had felt for many years that while as a Colony she was admired she was not very much appreciated. Thanks to the present Colonial Secretary and to others at home the clouds had now been dispersed, and Canada felt herself to be nearer the heart of the Empire than at any previous period. It was good that the next step should be in the direction of making the union so substantial in sentiment substantial also in fact, and he looked forward to a federation of the Empire colonially as well as imperially... (*The Canadian Gazette*, London, August 8th, 1901.) (1)

Some of Mr. Ross' addresses in Great Britain have just been published in pamphlet form. I do not find there the words above quoted, but the two following extracts are worth while reading.

Speaking in London, on the 25th July — this may be the same speech as the one referred to by the *Canadian Gazette* — Mr. Ross said:

I do not think we can keep a standing army for the defence of the Empire, but I believe we can contribute something for a naval reserve. We have 50,000 fishermen who, with a little training, could be drawn on liberally for the navy... (Page 18).

Then at Manchester, on the 31st of July.:

I say to you here in Manchester that we are willing — I think we are willing — in Canada to impose a duty of five per cent or all importations from any foreign country, excepting the Colonies of the Empire, the money to be applied as a war tax or as a defence fund for the defence of the Empire. Will you reciprocate that? Will you impose a five per cent tax on all imports from foreign countries, excluding the colonies, as a defence fund for the defence of the Empire? Surely that is a practical basis. ("NO! NO!")... (Page 27).

These NO ! NO ! are most expressive. When honest John Bull is generously offered some of our flesh and treasure, he tenders a

(1) See also Letter to the *Times*, 9 September 1901 (Page cr.)

graceful assent; but when comes the hint of "*reciprocating that*" he bursts out in loud protest. This is Imperialism in a nut-shell.

SIR FREDERICK YOUNG AT TORONTO.

On the 25th of October last, a meeting was called in Toronto by the Canadian branch of the British Empire League to meet Sir Frederick YOUNG, Vice-President of the Colonial Institute of Great Britain.

Sir Frederick naturally preached the imperialistic doctrine of which he is one of the most distinguished promoters.

I take the following quotations from the report published by the Toronto *Globe* on the 26th:

I have been invited to address you on a great national question, which has been called "Imperial Federation"... The subject has been deeply in my mind for many long years. More than a quarter of a century ago I published a volume under the title of "Imperial Federation," which advocated the principle to be adopted in dealing with it. I need not say that the ideas I then formed have only since been strengthened and confirmed in my mind. Although they were much ridiculed and derided as visionary and chimerical, they have been proved possible by time until they have encouraged me to believe that they are already descending from cloudland and are rapidly being brought within the range of practical politics.

And now, I will give you in brief my definition of Imperial Federation. It is comprised in the eight following words. It means "The government of the Empire by the Empire."—

to take place of "the Government of the People by the People"—

...Without attempting to define completely or accurately the class of questions which under a system of Imperial Federation would be dealt with by a supreme senate of the whole Empire, I would mention one or two of the class which would come forward before it. Those I would allude to would be questions of peace and war, national defence, communications between the heart and extremities of the Empire, fiscal questions from an imperial standpoint, emigration or colonisation...

The speaker then refers to the vice-regal trip over the Empire and to the "loyal sentiments and enthusiastic devotion" of the people in all parts of the King's realms, adding:

But even this outburst of sentiment is not alone sufficient. In political matters a great empire requires some machinery beyond personal loyalty, most valuable as it unquestionably is, in the present state of the world, for its due and successful government, lest the sentiment (left alone) should evaporate and die out...

The Hon. G. W. ROSS, Prime Minister of Ontario, moved a vote of thanks to Sir Frederick Young. He said:

It is true, as Sir Frederick Young has said, that there was a time in England when considerable apathy prevailed as to the colonies. I believe that time has happily passed away... Sir Frederick Young has referred to the great question of the Federation of the Empire. That is of all others the question that will ultimately settle whether the British Empire is to be consolidated, or whether the Colonies are to remain in a state of aloofness, as now, from the Empire... Get Federation just as soon as you can, but in getting it see that we in this outpost of the Empire retain just as much of that liberty which we now enjoy as Britain herself would retain.

Of the several schemes which have been brought forward, one suggested by Mr. Chamberlain — and of all our Colonial Secretaries I think he best grasps the colonial situation — is a permanent consultative council for the Colonies. I am not in favour of a permanent consultative council not responsible to the people of Canada... In the meantime I think we should go upon the methods adopted for the past few years, that is, to agree to conferences which may meet at London...

In concluding Mr. Ross said such questions as those of defence, of commerce, and so on might well be relegated to a federated parliament. It was necessary to impress the people of the old country with our trade advantages, and to do this he suggested an active propaganda in Britain. Their attention secured, the great market we would have would be readily appreciated.

There is a good deal of common sense talk in this — much more so than in some of the utterances given by Mr. Ross in London last summer. But if he wants "to impress the people of the old country" that we mean business, the Ontario Premier, as well as his fellow-Imperialists, had better stop assuring the British people that they may count at leisure upon Canada's devotion.

The vote of thanks was seconded by the Hon. George E. FOSTER, ex-minister of Finance. He said that —

He regretted that there was apathy in Great Britain among her statesmen in reference to the great question of Imperial unity, and hoped they would be stirred up from that apathy as a result of the royal tour and the unfortunate but glorious war in Africa...

He then spoke of the importance of mutual cooperation between Great Britain and her colonies to resist the keen competition of foreign trade, saying:

Britons speak of their generosity in buying from every market, but generosity, like charity, should begin at home...

Dr. PARKIN, C. M. G., was called upon and spoke very briefly of the apathy that, in his opinion, existed in Canada... To-day the position of affairs in South Africa was a cause of concern, yet Canadians remained cool and critical... They talked of the mobility of the North West Mounted Police. Why were there not 5,000 of them in South Africa now? Canadians ought also to closely study their duties, and enquire whether they should enjoy the advantages and escape the responsibilities of British connection. He agreed with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that Canadians should have a place in the councils of the Empire.

DOMINION DAY DINNER.

SIR LOUIS DAVIES AND HON. DAVID MILLS

One of the numerous social functions of which Mr. Chamberlain avails himself to warm up the devotion of the colonists, and especially of the Canadian official representatives during their annual pilgrimage to the Mecca of Imperialism, is the Dominion Day Dinner in London. That event took this year unusual majestic proportions. Instead of having the toast of Canada proposed by a Canadian, as it was done previously, the Prophet himself was induced to perform the operation.

The Dinner was presided by Lord Strathcona. Mr. Gilbert PARKER, M. P., in proposing "The Imperial Forces" remarked very sensibly that....

...It might be permitted to a simple citizen to point out that the colonies were now bearing, quite independently of any special contribution, a very large share in the defence of the Empire. It was all done voluntarily, and it could only be done voluntarily, for it could not now be said to the colonies "You must be taxed for this and that, for the defence of the Empire."

This was not the proper tune. Major General Sir Ian HAMILTON was more faithful to the duty of the hour:

....After referring to the great assistance which the Chairman had rendered in connection with the war, he expressed the hope that the bonds between the Mother country and the colonies, which have been drawn so closely together by a cruel war, would be riveted together in times of peace.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN then proposed "The Dominion of Canada". He said:

...When the utmost liberty was conceded to the Canadian people to work out their own destinies, to travel on lines they themselves should appoint, I think it cannot be denied that the statesmen of this country and many of the most eminent Canadians believed that that was only a step towards an inevitable result that it was only a movement in the direction of complete separation... But fortunately for us, and still more fortunately, I think, for Canada, these anticipations have not been fulfilled...

...I do not think the world has ever seen anything more striking, more suggestive, than the way in which all our colonies and dependencies have come together and have moved with us in the great struggle which has been forced upon us, and according to their opportunity have pressed forward to our assistance. They have shown, at any rate, that they understand the meaning of the word Empire. It means privileges, great privileges; but it means responsibilities and obligations, and they have shown that they at all events are not unwilling to fulfil them. Here is Canada, here is our greatest colony, far removed from the sound of strifes by thousands of miles without any direct interest, and yet stirred in unison with us, because an Imperial interest was endangered. "Touch us," the Empire may now say,

"in any part, and the whole Empire will thrill." In this quarrel, which in one sense is not Canada's, only in the sense in which she is a part of the Empire, she has sent us of her best. She has also sent us soldiers as we have been told to-night, unsurpassed in valour and efficiency, to stand shoulder to shoulder besides the army of Great Britain and besides the battalions of South Africa and of Australasia. There the union of the Empire has been sealed in blood. In the words, the eloquent words, of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, no bond of union can be stronger than the bond created by common dangers faced in common."...

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, on another occasion, is reported to have said that if we looked forward to a closer union, in which the colonies could recognise with us these common obligations as a matter almost of legal responsibility — that if we wanted their help, we must call them to our counsels. Well, Sir, of one thing I am convinced — that in this movement, which I think is progressing, nothing could be more fatal than to be premature. The movement is one which must come from our Colonies, and must not be unduly pressed upon them by us. But if they desire this closer connection, if they are willing to assist us, not merely with their arms, but also with their counsel and their advice, I believe that there is nothing that the people of this country will more readily welcome...

We are grateful to you for your support and for your sympathy. We are isolated — isolated among the great nations of the world — but as long as we have our relations — our household — around us we are not alone. As one of your statesmen has said, our isolation is "splendid" — as long as you share it...

One cannot fail to notice the striking difference of terms in which Mr. Chamberlain expresses his views on the military unity of the Empire and the political union which might be a consequence of the former. His sole object evidently — and in this he gives voice to the real feeling of the English people — is to get military help from the colonies; as long as he can get it without any compensation, or even any proportion of common control, being given to the colonies, he will keep the movement in the direction which the South African war and colonial jingoism have given to it.

It will be noted also that the Colonial Secretary did not make the slightest allusion to the no-precedent clause in the Order-in-Council adopted by the Canadian Government for the enlistment of troops in October 1899. Mr. Chamberlain has always ignored that reservation, probably judging that it was but a political dodge to smooth the apprehensions of those Canadians who had not yet "understood the meaning of the world Empire." And in this he was perfectly justified by the subsequent attitude of the Government and Parliament of Canada. He had another proof, in the present occurrence, that his opinion was well founded. Two Canadian Ministers were present at this Dominion Day Dinner. Both of them had in 1899 consented to the insertion of the no-precedent clause: but they carefully avoided to recall it to the attention of the Master of the Empire.

Mr. David MILLS said:

...The feeling in favour of the unity of the Empire had grown very rapidly during the last five years in Canada. Every one was anxious to see the unity of the Empire preserved; to see by degree some system of union organised which would prove satisfactory to the self-governing colonies and to the United Kingdom. They were satisfied that such a condition of things might be brought about, and that feeling was largely due to the reciprocal feeling which had sprung up in the United Kingdom...

This was especially conspicuous in the way the British Parliament had crushed down the week previous Sir Howard Vincent's proposition in favour of preferential treatment of colonial products on the British market (1).

Sir Louis DAVIES, who also responded, said they could not take any step which was more calculated to retard the cohesion of the Empire than to force at the present time the public opinion which was growing towards that cohesion. Alluding to Mr. Chamberlain's reference to the feeling which existed some years ago between the Mother country and her colonies, he said it was true that at one time there was a great deal of distrust on both sides; that they in the Colonies looked towards Downing Street with fear and distrust. But reciprocal sympathy had since sprung up between England and her colonies, and reciprocal action had followed on that sympathy...

We know what Canada has done for England of late; but I wonder what Sir Louis Davies could point out as the " reciprocal action " of England ?

...He was sorry to see in one of the London newspapers a short time ago a statement to the effect that a false public opinion had been worked up in Canada in reference to the action of the Canadian Government in sending troops to assist in South Africa. He had no hesitation in saying that never in his life he had seen such continuous enthusiasm in all parts of Canada as with respect to the action the Government of Canada then took.

This was an official correction of the statement which I had just made through the London *Daily News*, that the province of Quebec had accepted with great reluctance the action of the government and that, in the English provinces, the sentiment had not been quite as unanimous as the attitude of our public men and newspapers made it appear to be.

Lord DERBY (Late Governor of Canada under the name of Lord Stanley) in responding, said:

...They had listened to speeches from statesmen coming from this side of the water and from the other; they had had expressed in noble words those feelings of satisfaction at the manner in which the Dominion of Can-

---

(1) See page LXXXIX.

ada and the Mother country had been drawn together, and they had heard, in words which he himself believed to be prophetic, anticipations of a still greater and closer union.

Commenting on these speeches the "Times" from which I have taken the above extracts, said editorially:

...The colonists have shown that they know what Empire and Imperial citizenship mean. They mean great privileges, but they also mean, as Mr. Chamberlain reminded his hearers, responsibilities and obligations. The colonists have not flinched from either during the struggle. They have been eager to do that full duty. We are told to-day in a weighty article from our Toronto correspondent how many amongst them are now anxiously reflecting whether they permanently bear their due share of the burden of Imperial defence... (*Times*, July 2nd, 1901.)

VIII

Resistance of the Australians.

The British papers of September and October last have published several articles and correspondences showing that the new Australian Parliament has made up its mind to resist persistently the interference of the British Government in their legislation affecting trade, immigration and labour — especially as far as Asiatic labour is concerned. Mr. Chamberlain having sent a despatch to Lord Hopetoun, Governor General of the new Commonwealth, requesting some amendment to the proposed legislation on those questions, Mr. BARTON, the Prime Minister,

"stated that, with the concurrence of his colleagues, he had put a minute to that despatch stating that he quite agreed with the principle of the policy laid down, and promising that the Commonwealth Government would not propose any legislation conflicting with the wishes expressed."

"Mr. REID (ex-Prime Minister of New South Wales and Leader of the opposition in the new Federal House) fiercely denounced the Barton Cabinet for giving Mr. Chamberlain such a promise. It was both unconstitutional and improper that the home Government should be informed of the policy of the ministry before it was announced to the Commonwealth Parliament. He would seriously consider whether that action on the part of the Barton Cabinet should not be discussed by the House of Representatives on its merits."

(Despatch to the *Times*, Sept. 28th, 1901.)

Other correspondences state that being frightened at the attitude taken by Mr. Reid and by the Labour Party, the government will probably recede from their former attitude and reject Mr. Chamberlain's request. This is already done as far as Asiatic labour and immigration, and also pauper immigration from Europe, are concerned — without even excepting British immigrants that Mr. Ross is so anxious to have in the British Colonies.

Had he been a member of our Canadian Parliament, Mr. Reid would have had occasion for many similar denunciations. For the last four years, all the steps taken by the Canadian Government on matters of Imperial policy have been kept secret. Some of those bargains came out later on before Parliament; some have been made public in the most extraordinary way, such as Sir Louis Davies' announcement before the British Empire League (1); and others are still unknown. And every time, the opposition supported the Government in that Star-Chamber-like policy.

---

(1) See page CXV.

IX

Miscellaneous.

" The Future of the Anglo-Saxon race. "

(Article by Lord Charles Beresford, in the *North American Review*, December 1900, vol. 171, page 802).

. . . . . .

There are rocks ahead, however, which may yet wreck the Anglo-American barque. With moderately fair skies and smooth seas the supremacy of this great race has been built up, and with success have come all the evils which are so historically associated with the fall of the Empires and Nations of the past. In the Motherland, the corruption of money has wrought fearful havoc in the ranks of Society. In the United States, there are ominous mutterings of the coming storm. The Plutocrat is gaining power each day on both sides of the Atlantic, and the Democrat is likely to be crushed under the heel of a worse tyrant than a King who wore the purple, or any Ecclesiastical Dignitary who set up claims to temporal power.

British society has been eaten into by the canker of money. From the top downwards, the tree is rotten. The most immoral pose before the public as the most philantropic, and as doers of all good works. Beauty is the slave of gold, and Intellect, led by Beauty, unknowingly dances to the strings which are pulled by Plutocracy.

There was one good point about the old order of kingly supremacy and infallibility. It was its birthright to be the protector of chivalry, manliness and purity. Sullied as it was by many crimes, the ideal was always there, and each generation it brought forth fresh shoots. But what shall we say of the new order of Wealth, of the greed for gold which is its mainspring, of the way in which those who by birth and education should be the sternest protectors of the race, abandon all and fling themselves on the shrine of the Golden God?

This is the danger which menaces the Anglo-Saxon race. The sea which threatens to overwhelm it is not the angry waters of the Latin races, or of envious rivals, but the cankering worm in its own heart, the sloth, the indolence, the luxurious immorality, the loss of manliness, chivalry, moral courage and fearlessness which that worm breeds. (Pages 806-807.)

Depression of British Industry.

To those who may think that I am animated with prejudices, and painting under false colours the present situation of British industry, I commend the lecture of a book recently published in London by Mr. Fred. A. McKenzie, and entitled " The American Invaders ". This very interesting book shows the enormous displacement of English manufactured products in favour of American goods. It begins as follows:

American brains, enterprise, and energy are to-day ousting British traders in the battle for commerce in many lands.

Ten years ago England was easily first in the iron, shipping, cotton and coal industries. We took from America rawfood products in considerable quantities, but America was our greatest customer for manufactured goods. Now the situation is changed. America has already far outstripped us in iron and steel making. It is making great gaps in our shipping business, it is seriously competing with us in cotton, and is planning to take from us our export coal trade.

Where not long since America was our largest customer, we are now the biggest and most profitable buyers from America. The United States Government reports declare that England takes seventy-nine per cent of their products sent to Europe, and sixty per cent of all the products which the American farmer sends abroad.

It ends by the following dismal words:

We are becoming the hewers of wood and drawers of water, while the most skilled, the most profitable, and easiest trades are becoming American.

If my readers want some higher authorities to sanction the very crude and convincing facts enumerated by Mr. McKenzie, I might refer them to Mr. Chamberlain and to Lord Rosebery, those two shining lights of Imperialism.

Addressing a meeting of the Court of Governors of the Birmingham University, of which he is the Chancellor, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, on January 17th last:

No one can read the reports that have recently appeared of the progress of manufactures in the United States in the *Times* newspaper, and the letters which have appeared in that and other journals as to our general commercial position, without being fully aware that we have somewhat fallen behind, that we have reached a critical stage, and that it depends very much upon what we are doing now, at the beginning of the 20th century, whether at its end we shall continue to maintain our supremacy or even equality with our great commercial and manufacturing rivals.

And he insisted lengthily and forcibly on the importance of developing technical education. (*Times*, Jan. 18th., 1901).

The day previous, Lord ROSEBERY spoke at the annual dinner of the Wolverhampton Chamber of Commerce. He said:

...The war I fear is not a military war — and when I say I fear, I do not mean that I regard it with cowardice or disquietude — but the war I regard with apprehension is the war of trade which is unmistakably upon us... When I look round me I cannot blind my eyes to the fact that so far as we can predict anything of the twentieth century on which we have now entered, it is that it will be one of acutest international conflicts in point of trade. We were the first nation in the world — of the modern world — to discover that trade was an absolute necessity. For that we were nicknamed a nation of shopkeepers; but now every nation wishes to be a

nation of shopkeepers too, and I am bound to say that when we look at the character of some of these nations, and when we look at the intelligence of their preparation, that behooves us not to fear, but to gird up our loins in preparation for what is before us. There are two nations which are obviously our rivals and our opponents in the commercial warfare that is to come — I do not intend by any means to put others out of the category, but I do say that it is to America and to Germany that we have to look in the future for an acute and increasing competition with regard to our trade, and I am bound to say that in looking at these two countries there is much to apprehend. The alertness of the Americans, their incalculable natural resources, their acuteness, their enterprise, their vast population, which will in all probability within the next twenty years reach 100,000,000 make them very formidable competitors with ourselves. And with the Germans, their slow but sure persistency, their scientific methods, and their conquering spirit, devoted as these qualities are at this moment to preparation for trade warfare, make them also, in my judgment, little less redoubtable than the Americans...

I see a great many articles now in the papers as to the decline of our trade... I saw the other day in one of those papers, that, I think, out of 4,000 commercial travellers that had passed through Switzerland, only 28 represented English firms...

His conclusion, like that of Mr. Chamberlain, was the necessity of a strong technical and commercial education. (The *Times*, January 17th, 1901.)

On the 21st of March last, Lord ROSEBERY delivered an address on commercial education before a meeting called by the London School of Economic and Political Science. He there said:

...From whatever standpoint we may regard the age, I think we all must be aware that we are coming to a time of stress and of competition for which it is necessary that we should be fully prepared. It is not necessary here to indicate what form that stress or that competition may take, but in military matters, in naval matters, in commercial matters, in educational matters, we see more clearly day by day that we shall not be allowed to rest on any reputation that we possess already, but that we shall have to fight for our own hand in every department of human activity and human industry if we wish to keep our place.

(*Times*, March 22nd, 1901.)

Quite recently, Lord ROSEBERY spoke at Birmingham of the "Fatal gift" of "self-complacency" which characterises the English nation:

The nation which is satisfied is lost. The nation which is not progressive is retrograding. "Rest and be thankful" is a motto which spells decay... "What was good enough for my father is good enough for me" is a treasured English axiom which, if strictly carried out, would have kept us to wooden ploughs and water clocks. In these days we need to be inoculated with some of the nervous energy of the Americans...

Occasionally the nation wakes up and finds that its methods or machinery are out of date and even decayed.. It demands, for example, that some department or another should be placed on a business footing and brought up to date, and having made the demand it turns its attention to something else or goes to slumber...

(London *Times*, October 16th, 1901.)

On his return from America to London, Sir Thomas LIPTON was interviewed by a newspaper reporter. To many people, Sir Thomas is better known by the successive defeats of his *Shamrocks;* but as a financier and tradesman, he is one of the conquerors of this world. His opinion is a good authority.

Here is one of the questions that were put to the great British dealer:

> And do you think that the Americans are going to become still more formidable competitors with us in the future?
>
> I am sure of it, — was the reply. They get work ready while we are thinking about it, and they execute orders before we have finished drawing the plans. They have the best machinery it is possible to invent, and they pay wages high enough to attract the best workmen. Then, in their methods of doing trade they can beat us in neutral markets. We try to make people buy what we can to sell them. The Americans, on the other hand, are ready to sell what other people want to buy. They are taking away a lot of our trade, and they will take away more in the future if we do not wake up.
>
> (Montreal *Herald*, November 13th, 1901.)

A few weeks ago, the *London Electrical Review* had the following:

> We have over and over again used our influence to persuade British electrical engineers and promoters to burn their search-lights direct on India, and to do their level best to keep possession of the market so far as possible. The urgent necessity for following this advice is emphasised by a sentence in the Financial News: "It is believed that a wealthy American syndicate will shortly approach the municipalities of all the large towns of India not provided with electric installations, with a view of remedying the deficiency."

This problem of foreign competition and of the continued depression in British manufactures and trade has been occupying for some years the attention of the statesmen of the United Kingdom. As early as 1885, a Royal Commission was appointed to study this question. Its final report was published in 1886 (*Parliamentary Papers*, 1886, C. 4893). On the 28th of November 1895, a despatch was sent by Mr. Chamberlain to the Governors of all the Colonies, asking for information and details as to the then situation of British trade in the different parts of the Empire. The replies of the Governors were published in 1897 (*Parl. papers*, 1897, C. 8449). In 1898, the Board of Trade had a blue book issued containing extracts from memorandums received from the British diplomatic and consular agents all over the world, pointing out the main causes of the successful competition of foreign trade — American and German especially. (*Parl. Papers*, 1898, C. 9078).

By reading these documents, the reader may convince himself that I have not darkened purposely the situation of the manufacturer of Great Britain.

Americans in Canada.

In Mr. McKENZIE'S book, already quoted, a full chapter is devoted to the invasion of Canada by American capitalists. An article on this subject appeared in *The Expansionist*, of New York, in August last. I quote the following paragraph:

It is satisfactory to know that attention is being given by responsible and competent men in this country to the policy indicated in the foregoing —[that of bringing closer Canada and the United States]— and that advantage will be taken of the opportunity afforded by financial conditions to gain control of the transportation systems of Canada, as American capital is becoming a dominant factor in the development of Canada's forests and mineral resources. The two cannot be separated, but must be linked for the common benefit. (Page 24.)

The Countess of ABERDEEN was more than right when she said at Dundee, in October last:

Was not the gloom which over hung the land due in great measure to the fact that this country had departed from the principles of Liberalism and erected in its stead a false and tyrannical patriotism, before which they must bow down or be crushed? To throw doubt on the wisdom or justice of the present government was to brand themselves as traitors. We were squandering our sons and our money on the veld of South Africa, and allowing Americans to buy up our commercial interests both in this country and in Canada.

(*Times*, October 18th, 1901.)

Jingos may call this noble woman a "pro-Boer" and a "Little Englander"; — but she is undoubtedly more enlightened and more patriotic than those who go on, howling "God save the King" and "Rule, Britannia!"

Good Feeling between Briton and Boer in Cape Colony.

In a speech delivered at Manchester on the 19th November 1899, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman quoted the following words written by Lord Randolph CHURCHILL in 1891:

The old hostility between the English and the Dutch which at the time of the Transvaal war had attained a dangerous height seems to have entirely passed away. The two sections regard each other with a feeling of respect, friendship, and mutual trust. The genius of the Prime Minister, Mr. Cecil Rhodes, has mainly contributed to this auspicious state of things. He has known how to acquire and retain the confidence of the English and Dutch Colonists, and he has shown them in the daily practice of self-government that their interests are entirely and absolutely common.

It is useless to remind the reader that this was written previous to the Jamieson Raid, when Mr. Rhodes was enjoying the full confidence of the Boer element in Cape Colony.

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman added:

This writer goes on to speak of the settlement after Majuba, and, having been himself an active opponent and denouncer of that settlement in this country, he passed judgment upon it as a wise and prudent and necessary settlement.

(Extra Parliamentary *Hansard,* for 1899-1900. Page 134.)

At a dinner of the St. George's Club, in London, on the 10th of July 1897, Lord LOCH, late Governor of Cape Colony, spoke of the loyalty of the inhabitants of that country, saying:

...We might depend upon the loyalty of the Colonies for the maintenance of the integrity of the Empire. And in no whit backward were the people of the Colonies of South Africa in that respect. Whether they claimed their descent from English or Dutch progenitors, they were loyal, he was prepared to state, to the backbone. He had no hesitation in declaring that the descendants of the Dutch population of the Colonies of South Africa were as loyal for the maintenance of the integrity of the Empire and as loyal to the Crown as the people of any Colony in Her Majesty's Dominions...

Sir J. GORDON SPRIGG, leader of the utra-loyalist party and Prime Minister of the Cape, added on this subject that —

He did not think the difficulties of the Dutch and the English question were insurmountable. Two of his colleagues in the Cape Administration were what was called Dutch, and yet they worked together most amicably to support him, an out-and-out Englishman. They were endeavouring to weld together the various nationalities, the different communities, into one solid whole. Although considerable disturbance had been created in the relations between the English and the Dutch in South Africa, the course of administration which they had been pursuing there and the good sense which had been exhibited by the people of different nationalities had considerably allayed that disturbance, and a much better feeling now existed than was the case some time ago. He had the utmost confidence in saying that they would bring matters straight and that they would get back to the state of things which prevailed there some few years ago without resorting to the dreadful arbitrament of war.

(London *Times,* July 12th, 1897.)

Both these testimonies — the latter especially — are the more conclusive that they come from staunch opponents of Gladstone's policy and that they were given more than a year after the unjustifiable aggression of Mr. Rhodes' agent against the South African Republic.

Cecil Rhodes' Representatives in Canada.

Just as this pamphlet was going to the press, a friend of mine sent me a pamphlet where are to be found the names of the Canadians enlisted by Davis ALLEN, as members of the "Imperial South African Association." I give them here:

CANADIAN COMMITTEE.

Dr. J. G. RODDICK, M. P. (Chairman); W. C. EDWARDS, Esq., M. P. (Treasurer); A. MACNEILL, Esq., M. P.; R. L. BORDEN, Esq., M. P. (1); J. G. RUTHERFORD, Esq., M. P.; B. RUSSELL, Esq., Q. C., M. P.; L. P. BRODEUR, Esq., M. P. (Deputy speaker of the House of Commons) (2); Raymond PREFONTAINE, Esq., Q. C., M. P., (Mayor of Montreal); E. B. OSLER, Esq., M. P.; Ross ROBERTSON, Esq., M. P.; N. A. BELCOURT, Esq., M. P.; Hewitt BOSTOCK, Esq., M. P.; Hon. Senator ALLAN; Hon. Senator DRUMMOND; Hon Senator Sir John CARLING, K. C. M. G., P. C.; Sir John BOURINOT, K. C. M. G., Clerk of Parliament (Hon. Secretary).

---

(1) Now Leader of the Opposition.

(2) Now Speaker.